DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 176 UD 028 532

TITLE California's Changing Families: Social, Economic and Demographic Realities. Hearing before the Assembly Human Services Committee, Senate Health and Human Services Committee, and the Joint Select Task Force on the Changing Family (Los Angeles, California, March 1988).

INSTITUTION California State Legislature, Sacramento. Assembly.; California State Legislature, Sacramento. Senate.

PUB DATE Mar 88

NOTE 96p.

AVAILABLE FROM Joint Publications Office, State Capitol, Box 942849, Sacramento, CA 94249-0001 ($7.20 plus California sales tax).

PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Demography; *Economic Factors; *Family Characteristics; Family Programs; Federal Legislation; *Futures (of Society); Hearings; Minority Groups; Policy Formation; *Public Policy; Social Problems; *Sociocultural Patterns; State Legislation

IDENTIFIERS *California; Family Policy

ABSTRACT

At the hearing reported in this document, 38 witnesses representing a diverse cross-section of the state testified on the condition of the California family, with some also proposing solutions. Witnesses included legislators from the federal, state, and local levels; administrative and other workers from social service agencies; representatives of the business community; professors; students from junior high school through higher education; elementary school principals; parents; union representatives; social activists; and other citizens. The witnesses addressed a wide range of topics including the following: (1) needs for increased child care and heath services; (2) initiatives on family issues at the federal level; (3) women and children in poverty; (4) educational reform reflecting the demographic and social changes in society; (5) teen pregnancy; (6) increases in and the needs of minority populations; (7) labor force development; (8) alcohol and drug abuse prevention; (9) parental involvement in education; (10) the aging workforce; (11) home care workers; (12) employment benefits; and (13) welfare reform initiatives. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED346176

CALIFORNIA'S CHANGING FAMILIES:

SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC REALITIES

Hearing before the

Assembly Human Services Committee
Senate Health and Human Services Committee
and the
Joint Select Task Force on the Changing Family

Tom Bates, Member of the Assembly
and
Diane E. Watson, Member of the Senate

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John Mills

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

March, 1988
Los Angeles, California

0378A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD 028 S32

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Additional copies of this publication may be purchased for $7.20 per copy from:

Joint Publications Office
State Capitol, Box 942849
Sacramento, CA 94249-0001

Please add California sales tax. Make checks payable to STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

Joint Select Task Force on the Changing Family

CO-CHAIRS
TOM BATES, MEMBER OF THE ASSEMBLY
DIANE E. WATSON, MEMBER OF THE SENATE

STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
PHONE (916) 324-0399

February 15, 1991

Dear Friend:

The family remains the fundamental unit within society. The role and functions of the family, however, are going through a transition which is testing both families themselves and the social policies designed to assist and support them.

The Joint Select Task Force on the Changing Family, comprised of six legislators and twenty citizens, was charged with investigating "the changing family" and recommending ways to strengthen it.

The first stage in this process was to learn more about current conditions: What are the social, economic and demographic conditions of California's families? What do today's families look like in terms of structure and background? Are families able to provide basic needs such as housing, health care, and a secure and loving environment? How involved are parents in their children's mental, physical and moral development? What are the barriers to successful parenting?

This hearing was one of the first steps in that process. Almost forty people, representing a diverse cross section of the state, testified as to the condition of the family. Some also shared proposed solutions to the issues which they raised.

This hearing and the on-going work of the Task Force are breaking important new ground. Futurists talk about life in the United States in the 21st Century; many of these changes are already occurring in California, and they are clearly reflected in the health and stability of our families.

Changes can easily be seen in new family structures and the growing ethnic and language diversity here in California. Changes are also occurring in the economy, further complicating the ability of all parents to provide for their families and adding to the growing conflict between being a good worker and a good parent.

By focusing on the family, the Task Force hopes to develop a more complete, less fragmented look at the well being of all Californians. For example, children, parents, and seniors are all connected, as are the myriad of social programs designed to serve them. By looking at all public policy through the lens of the family, we can strengthen and support individuals.

I am pleased to respond to public interest in this hearing by making available the complete transcipt of this important hearing held in March, 1988, in Los Angeles.

Sincerely,

Tom Bates

TOM BATES
Co-Chair, Task Force
on the Changing Family

CALIFORNIA'S CHANGING FAMILIES:

SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC REALITIES

Hearing before the

Senate Health and Human Services Committee
Assembly Human Services Committee
and the
Joint Select Task Force on the Changing Family

Tom Bates, Member of the Assembly

and

Diane E. Watson, Member of the Senate

March, 1988
Los Angeles, California

Transcript edited by:
Josephine Arasteh, Ph.D.
Research Associate
Institute for Human Development
University of California, Berkeley

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Welcome and Introduction 1
ASSEMBLYMAN TOM BATES, Co-Chair
SENATOR DIANE E. WATSON, Co-Chair
Joint Select Task Force on the Changing Family

SENATOR JOSEPH HARPER, State of Connecticut 2

CONGRESSWOMAN PATRICIA SCHROEDER 3

YOLANDA NAVA, Reporter, KCBS News 12

JING LYMAN, HUB Corp. for Enterprise Development 13

LILLIAN GARLAND 17

RON JOHNSON, Youth and Family Center 18

JAN BRIEDENBACH, HUB Corp for Enterprise Development 20

DR. ED ZIGLER, Director, Yale Bush Center in Child
Development and Social Policy 23

COUNCILWOMAN JOY PICUS, City of Los Angeles 31

SENATOR JOHN LARSON, President Pro Tem
State of Connecticut 32

CONGRESSWOMAN CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER, Rhode Island 35

COUNCILWOMAN GLORIA MOLINA, City of Los Angeles 38

LEO ESTRADA, Professor,
School of Planning and Archtecture, UCLA 39

DR. FERNANDO TORRES-GIL, Professor,
Gerontology and Public Administration, USC 43

KATI HAYCOCK, Co-Director, California Achievement Council . . . 49

NATALIE COPELAND, Audubon Junior High School 52

MELISSA CROWDER, Student 54

DR. YVONNE AGUIRRE DAVIS, Principal
Griffin Elementary School 56

QUYNH TANG, Student 58

TERESA ROBLES, Student 59

Table of Contents, continued

JOSE LOPEZ, Student 59

MENH VONG, Student 59

MARVIN MARTINEZ, California Tomorrow 60

ADELINA ALEGRIA, Human Resource Center
Le Conte Junior High School, Hollywood 61

CELIA ARROYO, Parent 62

ROBERTO GIL, Student 64

ELLEN TENINTY, Center for Ethics and Social Policy 65

FELIX CONTRERAS, Deputy Regional Administrator and Director
Office of Administration and Management Services
U.S. Department of Labor 66

ELISEO MEDINA, President
Service Employees International Union, Local 102 69

HILARIA VELEZ 72

JESUS VELEZ 73

SUSANA FERRELL, home care worker 73

TOM COLEMAN, Los Angeles City Task Force on Family Diversity . 73

BEVERLY SHELDON 76

COLLEEN FAHEY-FEARN, Women's Economic Agenda Project 78

DORCEA MAYDEN 81

LINDA TARR-WHELAN 82

SUSAN ANDRES 84

Public comments 86

CO-CHAIRMAN TOM BATES: I'm Tom Bates and I'm co-chair of the Joint Select Task Force on the Changing Family. Senator Diane Watson and I will be co-chairing, and I'm going to start out by introducing Senator Watson.

CO-CHAIRWOMAN DIANE WATSON: Thank you so much, Assemblyman Bates. As Co-Chair of the Joint Select Task Force on the Changing Family and as Chair of the Senate Health and Human Services Committee, I'd like to welcome all of you to today's hearing. The fact that we're holding a hearing on the issues of importance to California families is, I feel, a very significant move on our part. It indicates that those of us who feel the need for a strong family policy in this state and in this nation are becoming organized in our efforts to recognize the changes that families are undergoing and the need for strong leadership to address those changes. While our hearing today will focus on California, similar efforts are underway in other states as evidenced by the presence of Senators Larson and Harper, two leaders in family policy from Connecticut, and we thank them for sharing themselves and also their remarks with us this morning. On the national level, although our country lacks universal access in health care and a basic income support system for families, I'm encouraged by the efforts of our keynote speaker this morning, Congresswoman Pat Schroeder. She'll be introduced to you in a few minutes. And she has been promoting a national family policy. For that, I thank her from the bottom of my heart.

The Children's Defense Fund recently issued a very informative and thought-provoking briefing on American children in 1988. It captures the essence of why we're here today. And I'd like to read just a short excerpt from it:

"The first high school graduating class of the 21st Century will enter first grade in September 1988. These preschoolers are the future leaders, workers, parents, college students, taxpayers, soldiers, and the American hope for the 21st Century. Many of them are off to a healthy start but millions of them are not.

"Today one in four of them is poor; one in five is at risk of becoming a teen parent; one in six has no health insurance; one in seven is at risk of dropping out of school; and one in two has a mother in the labor force; but only a minority have safe, affordable, quality child care."

Although these are national statistics, the situation in California, which has 10 percent of the nation's population, is very similar. What can we, as concerned policy makers and as concerned citizens, do? We can begin by looking at what is happening to the family today and by recognizing that a diversity of family structures exists along with diverse needs for services. We can listen to the projections of our experts in demography, economics, social welfare, business, and in other areas. This will help us to anticipate what will be happening to families and to the economy as we enter the 21st Century. And finally we can put all our information together in a cohesive and sensitive fashion and tie together effective programs and policies that reflect the changing needs of all people in California. What we do and what we don't do today in addressing family policy issues will be felt by

many generations to come. If we all work together for the collective good of our children and our families, we will have a future that we can look forward to. That's the reason why you're here; that's the reason why we're here. And we're so pleased to have you because I know you come because you are the converted and the committed to come out on a Saturday morning.

I think we have a very exciting new program and I want you to know that today's Task Force Hearing on the Family, Year 2000, is sponsored by Assemblyman Tom Bates and his committee, Assembly Human Services; the Joint Select Task Force on the Changing Family; by my committee, Senate Health and Human Services; and by Senator Roberti, The President Pro Tempore of the Senate. I welcome his representative, Donne Brownsey, who's been very active in coordinating the activity this morning. And, of course, we have a very exciting person so we're going to keep her a secret for just a moment. But I'd like you to meet one of the Senators from Connecticut who came all the way out here to be with us today; and the other one you're going to hear at noon.

So let me introduce to you Senator Joseph Harper from Connecticut. Senator.

SENATOR JOSEPH HARPER: Thank you, Senator Watson, distinguished panel, guests and citizens, and concerned people of California. In Connecticut I'm the Co-chairman of the Legislature's Appropriations Committee. In another capacity, I have spent some time working with our distinguished president, Senator Larson, in developing over the last two years a comprehensive plan of family policy in the State of Connecticut. I'm pleased to be in the State of California, and I'm very pleased to see this state as well is working on an area that is just not receiving enough attention, not just in other states but nationwide.

I would just like to say that I don't really think we're breaking new ground in an original sense. Many of the issues, many of the component parts of family policy have been around for many years but they have been addressed in a fragmented way. Issues of poverty, job training, available, affordable, and quality day care, maternal and infant health care, health insurance, available and affordable housing, the teenage pregnancy problem, illiteracy, maternal and medical leave, displaced homemakers -- it's really collectively all -- affect one major entity in our country, and that's the family unit, the family structure, the ability of that unit to perform its function. That is what we and you in the State of California are dedicated emphatically to do: to begin to pull together these many fragmented policy approaches and make them work effectively to save the American family. To work at a national level, ultimately, is probably more important than what we're doing at the state level because we have one of the very few nations in the world where there's not enough in national family policy.

So again I'm pleased to be here today. Senator Larson and I are joined by our three staff persons -- Patreka Grey, Pam Southworth, and Ceci Woods -- who will be available to talk with people about what we're doing in Connecticut.

CO-CHAIRWOMAN WATSON: Thank you very much, Senator.

I'd also like to introduce to you, all the way from Connecticut, Patreka Grey, who's the Chairperson of the Commission on the Status of Women.

And we have a representative from Mayor Tom Bradley's office, Julie Tuleson. Thank you so

much for coming and representing our Mayor.

Now we want to hear from our most illustrious speaker. And I like to hold good things in surprise to kind of whet your appetite, but you should have been with us for breakfast. Those of you who found your way down to the Biltmore Hotel and were in your seats at 7:30 were paid off, because you had an opportunity to hear this woman firsthand. So many of you hurried over here to the State Building because you needed to hear the rest of the story. To bring us the rest of the story is someone who was courageous enough to announce that she was going to run for the President of the United States. She very simply felt it was now time for someone who represented the majority of people and the majority of voters in this country to run because she realized that women were 53 percent of the population.

This woman is an elected official who serves as a role model for all of us, not just women but for men too because, if you can emulate her courage, her strength, her humor, her intelligence, and her knowledge of foreign affairs, you too could run for president. She has those attributes. She has been 16 years in Congress from the State of Colorado. But most importantly she was in the forefront of family issues even before we knew what they were. Whether the issue was child care or prenatal leave or any of the numerous issues that face the family, this particular person has been a strong supporter of policies that recognize the changing needs and configurations of families today. She has taken upon herself to stump throughout this country, to spread the word of the danger our domestic structure is in if we don't take a look at the family. And so I want you to hear her because she's a fascinating and captivating speaker. And let's all stand and give her a California welcome, Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder.

CONGRESSWOMAN PATRICIA SCHROEDER: Thank you very much. My goodness, like an exercise class, you have to get up and down and up and down. Thank you so much, Senator Watson and Senator Roberti and Tom Bates, for putting this together and the distinguished visitors we have from other states, which only says how far in front you are in California. And let me say I am really impressed by your dedication to be here on Saturday morning to hear me, and that says an awful lot too.

So I stand before you thinking what in the world do I say to a group who clearly knows these issues, knows how important they are, made the effort to get here, and where do we go from here? Well, I am so pleased that you went out looking at a state policy and I think what you are doing is very helpful because other states will follow along. But we certainly need the federal government to get involved too. And I need not tell you that talking about families in Washington is not a big power issue. I mean this is the most powerful capitol of the most powerful nation. You know, they even go crazy if it tries to snow on them back there because how could you dare snow on such powerful people in the powerful capitol of the powerful country. Family problems are not powerful; families don't vote because they're usually too busy scrambling around trying to do things. I think a lot of politicians probably have the last traditional families left in America. They still have wives. Diane Watson and I don't have a wife; I guess we can even say Tom Bates doesn't really have a wife either, like when I say my husband doesn't have a wife in the norm of someone who helps and fills in gaps and

say you don't have to worry about any of that. And it's wonderful. We all love them. Germaine Greer said, "Everybody needs a wife." (Not so many need husbands!) We all know how nice that would be, just like everybody would like to have a mother. Yet we probably have a higher percentage of people in national office that have traditional families than any other part of our society. As a consequence, they don't really understand what the demography changes mean. So it's twice as hard to get them to push any of these policies. When you try to get them to push the policies, they say, "Well, look, you give me a list and pick out one of the things that you really like and hopefully it won't cost any money. Then, if we pass it, we hope you'll think that we're just terrific and give us awards for the rest of the year for being pro-family or pro-woman or pro-something." They don't say that to anybody else, which says that they probably agree with these issues philosophically but they are priority number 739 and they're just not going to move them to the top of the list. They'll do a little token thing in that area each time and meanwhile America's families get in worse and worse shape. Now again, I don't have to tell you that. All of us have seen it in our own lives.

When I got out of law school with my husband, what we paid for our first house, you can't buy a decent car for. And certainly income hasn't kept up with it. And you can go on and on with those kind of stories. I really began to get a sense of what the demography meant when I went around giving speeches -- I'm on the Armed Services Committee -- about my nuclear test ban bill or other issues. The first question I usually got would be from a young woman saying, "Well, forget all that stuff. What I want to know is when is it a convenient time to have a baby?" And I would think that's probably the last question I would have ever asked if I had gone to see a pilot. What has changed so that's all this person is thinking about? That's what the demography really means; that when a young person gets out of college, they're very apt to have an incredible amount of debt on their hands. All they can do is jump into more debt, if they're buying a home or something else. They try to get a career going but the biological clock is ticking in their ear. The incredible stress a young family is under when they're starting out is unbelievable. And what do we have for all that stress in our society? We have seminars on how to deal with stress where they tell you to go to a spa, take some time off. We just have not dealt at all with the reality of what is happening to young people as they move into this work place and not being able to buy into the American dream that their parents were able to buy into much earlier.

If we're just going to insist that we have the traditional Ozzie and Harriet family, only eight percent of the people will be in that situation, and we'll die out as a nation, and that's not a good idea either. I was saying this morning at breakfast: You've got two options. If you wait till everybody finally gets themselves financially in that position, we're going to have to find a way to make octogenarians fertile, because it's going to take that long to pay off everything and get to that position and I'm not sure we want that alternative either. Or we better start looking at what we can do to lessen some of the pressure that's on America's families. And by America's families, we're defining it as you are, the function of family: where you go and they have to let you in. You don't have to look like Ozzie and Harriet. Wherever you go and they have to let you in, that is a family unit. That is the basic building block upon which society is built and this government is built, because

all those little units add together and that's the overall foundation.

There's no person in this room who doesn't know that our foundation is in great trouble. By any criteria that you use, the United States is in worse shape than any other industrialized nation. And what do I mean by that? I mean divorce; I mean all of our problems with adolescents. I don't care whether it's substance abuse, alcohol abuse, suicide, pregnancy, our adolescents are rated the number one position on everything and we're not very proud of that. We're now number 19 in infant mortality. This is supposedly the richest nation in the world. Number 19 in infant mortality. And you heard Senator Watson give the statistics about the condition that our children are in.

We also have a terrific problem with older citizens. We are a throw-away society, the Pepsi generation. I have always said in this society: Men age but women rot. That's a very tough thing but I go around and I talk to young girls all the time and I always ask them what their favorite TV shows are. Invariably one of them says "Golden Girls." When I say why, they say, "Oh, because it's so comforting to know that you can be an older woman and have fun." If you're eight years old you're worried about that. Now my generation was, but I had hoped we had passed through that, but we haven't.

For men aging is tough and I don't want to diminish it, but one of the fastest growing poverty groups is still older women and we do more age discrimination in everything against women. From the time you're 21 on if you're a woman, people start saying, "Well, honey, it's all downhill from here." That's crazy.

Most importantly, we need to be much more caring about our most important product and it's going to be our "software," our people. And the way you get to that "software" is where it starts out, in the family segment. As I said, we have the worst statistics on our family segments coming apart. If we had a map of the world up here and we colored in every country that had better family policies than we do, we'd color in every single country except South Africa, which we've never looked to as a progressive unit, Burkina Faso, which used to be Upper Volta, and we've never really looked to them as a great progressive leader, the Sudan, and Guiana. That's it. Now that's the five countries when you include the U.S. that don't have any kind of real comprehensive family policy.

Being a woman in the Congress, I'm always getting legislators from other countries coming in and saying, "Let me see your family leave policy." They look at it and say, "Oh, we did this in the '30s. We thought you were progressive." Now that is their response. The Chamber of Commerce comes in and looks at it and says, "My goodness, this is communism!" Now somewhere in between, we've got to figure this out. I think there is a "connect" between the fact that every other country has given its families more support than we have and we have the worst statistics on families. I think there might be a connection! It's up to us to make that connection to some of the people who live along the banks of the Potomac, because they don't get it.

Now there's another piece. People are hesitant to talk about this, because if they talk about it, they're so afraid they're going to get labeled as a big spender. Here it is, the '60s are back, big-spending liberals, the whole number.

Let me give another piece. As I go around doing my family policy tour, I'm also chairing the burden-sharing panel on the Armed Services Committee because I want to make one more connection. We put the map of the world back up there again. I say we, the United States, have positively nothing to apologize for. We're the only country I know where twice we have sent our young people abroad for major world wars to defend freedom in other parts of the world, not just here. Most people always defended at home but, we don't know what sending them abroad is like. When we can get our allies to commit troops, we break open a bottle of champagne. So we certainly have nothing to aplogize about that. Then after World War II we did something that I find incredible: We rebuilt not only our allies that were on their knees but our enemies. If you don't think that's hard, just imagine your average divorce case that you're familiar with and asking one spouse to rebuild the other spouse that may be needing more education or whatever. It doesn't work real well, does it? So if you think about the tension in that human relationship, imagine after a war, where all sorts of people have given their lives, to rebuild your enemies. It's amazing. So we have nothing to apologize for there.

Now let us talk about 1948 when we started NATO. What was that all about? We had to start NATO because otherwise we were afraid Europe would be overrun. The idea was we'll get the Marshall Plan going -- and remember Marshall was a general -- and get NATO on its feet and then it can pick up the burden. This week we just celebrated the 40th anniversary of NATO, with a big birthday party in Brussels. Guess what? The president went over and picked up the check again. Now I don't want an ally bash, because I don't blame them at all. If somebody reaches over and grabs the check, how many times do you protest too much? We haven't asked them to do it. For the last eight years we've told everybody not to worry; we will go anywhere; we will build up; we will protect the whole world; and so on. We're only six percent of the world's population but we're going to do it all. I don't think they're upset, so let them know it. If they want to spend their tax money that way, let them. We'll spend our tax money at home. Let us put the map of the world back up and look at all those family programs again. Every single country has got better college programs; in some countries not only is the tuition free, but they even pay you while you go to school. Amazing! Obviously, they have much better child care and much better housing programs as well. Why? Because they spend their tax money on that, and we spend our tax money on defending them. It's nice of us but there may be a "connect."

I was in Orange County last night where people again would say, "Oh, these crazy, big-spending democratic programs." I said, "Okay, you conservatives. If you don't like that, let's look at it this way: You conservatives with your tax dollars are subsidizing those socialist programs in Europe because if you weren't funding everything, they'd have to pay for it too." It breaks out the sweat; the average American taxpayer paid last year $1,100 for the defense of developed allies. The average European contributed $300 a piece; and the average Japanese contributed $100. Now we can keep doing that but if you want to know where the bucks are, that's it. I don't see anything wrong with saying, "We're really delighted the program worked; welcome to the grown-up table; we're all going to sit around here and define how we share these burdens." We've got to have a president that figures that out too, rather than runs over and grabs the check.

I know somebody's instantly saying, "Well, we don't want them paying to rearm." No. Maybe we don't want them paying to rearm, but they could certainly help rebuild the economy of the Philippines; they could help pick up the tab for the World Bank and the IMF that we're having trouble meeting because we've got so many other payments. There are also the things they could do to help put money out there, if we ask. We never ask. So nobody volunteers to spend their money if you don't ask. So there is a phenomenal "connect" between burden sharing with our allies and with where we're going to get the money, and how we work all this out.

We spent $175 billion last year defending developed allies. That's more than our national debt was. So it's worthwhile to ask how you can put all of this together in a package, and we've got to start being aggressive about it. Look at other countries and their infant mortality rates, their better health care, and their education programs are now better. Japanese diplomats don't like to be assigned here because they think that their children's education goes down. That ought to concern us, just a little bit. After all, who are we going to be competing against? Hopefully we can put that together as we march out, and talk to people one on one. We can get much more aggressive about saying, "Look, I know what the basic premise in America is. The basic premise in America is you shouldn't have a family if you can't afford it." So we're going to punish those that do. But who are we really punishing? We're punishing ourselves. Everybody else figured it out. If you don't pay now, you're going to pay a whole lot more later. To put a kid in the penitentiary in Colorado, for one year, you can send him to Harvard for five. I'd much rather spend my money sending him to Harvard.

We did a survey of young people in our juvenile detention in Colorado and found that 90 percent of them had learning disabilities that had never been picked up before. Now there may not be any connection, but I think there is. If you had picked those kids' learning disabilities up earlier through screening programs, that would have all been canceled, and I think they would have fit much better in the classroom. But if you're sitting in a classroom with dyslexia and you're seeing everything backwards and nobody figures it all out, you start acting out. We would too, wouldn't we? Wouldn't it make much more sense to spend money on screening versus money on incarceration?

We have just had a new book come out in Colorado that is the grimmest book I would ever want to read, but nevertheless I'm delighted it came out. I have been pushing family medical leave which says: In America, we're really shocked. Sixty percent of women are work in jobs where if they have a baby, they can be fired for having a baby. No other country does that. Not only that, but the rest of women in most states can be fired if they don't come back to work the day they are physically able; if you are physically able as a mother to walk, then you must be at work. We don't do anything about the bonding between parent and child, and that's why I think this is so critical. This book in Colorado has examined every crime committed in the last few years by young people that we don't understand -- eight-year-olds killing their parents, doing terribly antisocial acts that we just can't figure out -- and traces it back to the very important bonding period; that is, if the child doesn't have an adult to bond to in those first few months, then they don't make the path for society and there's a detachment; and it's very hard to ever build that in someone. I hate to sound like the bill is an anti-crime measure but it is amazing. We keep coming up with more and more research showing these

connections and yet we don't act on them. We don't act on them at all.

Then we did our family tour; it was wonderful. We took Dr. Barry Brazelton from Harvard, a pediatrician who has developed the Brazelton Scale, showing you those first four months of development in a child and how critical they are. He shows us wonderful movies. People can't believe it. First of all, he stands there with the baby and you just assume that he's got one. He gets so into it. He's there showing us movies about how, within just a few days after birth, you can tell by looking at their toes whether babies are dealing with their mom or their dad or a stranger. That's how quickly they put the pieces together. Moms in our societies are, "Hi, baby. How are you?" The baby's just mellow and great and everything's all relaxed. Dads are the excitement in our society. Dads always come and do their poking, "Hi, kid, hi." Then they see their dad, and everything is like, "Here he comes. Oh, boy, a little fun now." They've got that all together in just a few days. They see a stranger and they don't process it. It's like, "I don't get it." Yet they do understand both dads and moms very early on. No one knows why but they do. That is a very important bridge to the outside world that they need to build on and keep going. Yet what do we do? Well, we tell the mother she has to go back to work and we don't want to give fathers any rights at all.

I'm constantly having groups say, if you just knocked men out of it, we might go on with it. Well, now, I'm sorry. Men ought to get mad. They have every right to be a father and we're taking that right away from them. You go back and look at the traditional American family and fathers were very involved. The traditional family was an economic unit and a family unit, Ma and Pa's Store. It was part of our language. Ma and Pa Farm, Ma and Pa Ranch. They lived together; the family worked together, and they lived over the store. Then came World War II where we created many suburban communities, the power in the lower belts that ringed our cities; where men were ordered out at 7:30 in the morning, not allowed back at 6:00; and if you saw one on the street during the day, you called the police. This was how it was supposed to be. Men probably felt more at home at the office; and the women said for better or for worse but never for lunch. Then suddenly they didn't know their kids. We constantly hear men saying, "I don't know my kids; I try to relate to them for the first time at 16." It's because we haven't filled them in. For heaven's sake, they have a right to be fathers and enjoy them too. That's why people are watching the "Cosby Show;" that's why people are watching "Family Ties" and they're saying, "These fathers are having fun."

Now, the other part of our tour is Gary David Goldberg from "Family Ties" and Diana Meens. They bring their films; in fact, more people watch their films and their TV show than vote, which I might remind the politicians that there is something to family. And number two, the reason they watch that show is to learn how to become a family. That's how poorly we have gotten into family skills. It is really time that we start resurrecting it and yet, again, all of our family policies still keep getting hung on women. I guess our first message is: men, go out and take it back.

Look at welfare reform today. It's all hinged on making the welfare mother work. There is absolutely no talk about getting jobs for men, for putting those families back together. They don't relate in any way to middle-class women. We say we don't want to do anything that would encourage <u>them</u> to work. Now I don't get that at all. But it's really interesting how we shift our positions

depending on what economic class we're talking about. And we have always dealt in this country with all the issues every other country call the "family issues." They are called "women's issues" in this country. They aren't women's issues; they're everybody's issues. That's why this whole new family focus is terribly important. We cannot let them go back to the old way.

Now as I look at the Congress, let me tell you some of the things we have that are very important that we might be able to move on this year. We've got the Family Medical Leave bill. It allows you time, without pay, unfortunately, but time to be home with your child for bonding at either birth or adoption, by either the father or the mother. It also allows you time without pay if a child is chronically ill or a dependent parent is chronically ill. It also says that if you, the wage earner, become chronically ill, you can't be fired for getting sick; you're allowed back. We call this the Family Medical Leave Act. It's ready to go to the floor for a vote.

We also have the child care bill, the ABC bill; it's very important. It puts $2.5 million out for states to match and move forward in creating more quality child care slots and subsidizing people's child care on a sliding scale with income so that it's not just the rich that get good child care. Now we're taking up the Fair Housing bill. We just marked it up; we'll be moving it to the Judiciary Committee. We put it there to protect families so that realtors cannot discriminate against families in renting and housing. That has become a bigger and bigger problem, and we think housing is very important. So that may move this year.

We have pay equity before Congress. It means paying women equally for the same job. How long do we have to go on with it? Reagan's our Labor Department now and says that today in America if a man and woman have worked at the same job (these are just average statistics) and start at 9:00 in the morning, the woman has to work till 10:30 at night to make equal pay as the man who works until 5:00. Who's going to fix dinner? Pay equity is a long time overdue, but we get it in there because we don't recognize women in the work force as being there because they have to work. One out of ten women in America will get through life not having to work. The other nine out of ten will <u>have to</u> work. All of our laws assume all women only work when they get tired of soap operas and are bored and just want to do something temporarily for a little money for jam. Not true! They are helping support their families; they want to get equal pay, and that's long overdue. They always take equal taxes from us. I honestly think if they came to blacks, Hispanics, women, and Asians, and everyone sat down and they said, "Look, we'll give all of you a 40 percent cut on your taxes if you don't ask us to enforce laws equally," we might negotiate. But as long as they don't come and make that offer, which they certainly don't, then they had better make sure that money goes to programs where we're all treated equally. Tax us equally; treat us equally. That's all we ask, and I think that's the bottom line and very fair. Nobody wants to fight me usually when I get to that point.

Now again, when people come back and tell you this all costs money, since when did babies cause the debt? Since when did four-year-olds cause the debt? They didn't. We know what's causing the debt. If you want to talk about the welfare queens of the '80s -- the welfare queens of the '80s are the military industrial complexes -- we want to lay it right where it is. For all those radio

reports we used to hear about welfare queens and how they were living, they didn't at all compare to these other guys.

So what are we doing? Well, we're going out and trying to get the presidential candidates to focus much more on the family. Brazelton, Schroeder, Gary David Goldberg, and Mehime (?) went all over the South. We went around New England in the early primary states. We had all sorts of people cosponsoring us. First of all, people couldn't believe it. They couldn't believe that people were coming around and not asking for anything from them, including a vote, or asking for money from them. The '80s have made us so surly! We just always assume there's a gimmick. The main criticism we had of all of our family forums was that they weren't long enough. Now I must tell you, they went two-and-a-half hours and I've never been in a political program where someone said, "You know, we wanted it to go longer." We were out drawing everywhere the crowds that the candidates have. We took it to St. Petersburg, Florida, because people said older people don't care about this. Well, you want to know something? They care a lot about this; they understand. We filled that auditorium with older people and they were as much into Dr. Brazelton's baby things as they were into the problems that we have for health care, long-term care and the other things that we also had included. They were every bit into that whole forum.

We visited South Carolina. Everybody thinks, "Oh, South Carolina!" Charleston, South Carolina -- they're like the Chinese; they eat rice and worship their ancestors; no hope. We went in there, and first of all, the Chamber of Commerce backed us. When we contacted the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce and said, "Excuse me. You may want to get off this list, because, you see, the national chamber's against everything we're for, this fellow said, "Honey, down here in South Carolina we have figured out that if the women quit, we will all go bankrupt, so we don't care what they say."

Then we had the police backing us in Florida, which was quite amazing, and I said, "Could you please explain to me why the Florida State Police are backing us?" Then they said, "Because we are so tired of family violence and we don't know when somebody's going to put these connections together." So they got it. All sorts of people that folks tell you, "Oh, no, no; they wouldn't understand it," they did understand it. We just can't get it understood in Washington. It's got to be understood everywhere because for these policies, it's going to take the federal government; it's going to take the state government, the city government, the county government; it's going to take the private sector; it's going to take everybody being creative in this area. Otherwise, we're not going to make it. We're that far behind, and we've got to make a push everywhere we can make a push, doing whatever we can do. There's just too much at stake. This is the year to make it because the window's open this year. We're selecting a new president. If we don't have a president that understands this, we're in deep, deep trouble for at least another four years and maybe eight. Time just keeps going on and our statistics just keep getting worse; so we don't need that. Also don't forget your senators and congressmen. We have an awful lot to do in there, but there's no big money around family issues, and so it doesn't have the glitz. I think Rambo's done a lot to our politics, at least at

the national level, because everybody's got to be macho; you can't be wimpy. They're so afraid that talking about families is wimpy.

I want to say the strongest candidate I see is one that's not afraid to talk about compassion, not afraid to talk about families, and not afraid to talk about human connections. After all, none of us is an island and we all are inter-related, and if they don't understand that, I'm not sure I want them sitting there with their finger on the nuclear button or anything else. That's something that I hope they also hear as we move along.

We traveled around the South, which was very receptive, getting that message back to the candidates. We're trying to be bipartisan; we don't want this to be a partisan issue. We are tired of the people who are really anti-family saying they are pro-family and then labeling all the things we're for as anti-family. You know the kind. We're really hoping that everybody around the country joins us because in Washington they always say, "There go the people. If you don't get out in front, we won't be their leaders." So, you know, there is no hope for that bunch unless you get out in front. I am here to say, "Be in power and get out in front!"

What I do on this tour is talk about empowerment. What I have found across America is that in the last seven years we have gotten so remorseful, we've forgotten a lot of the empowerment tools we knew. Most people's political civics ended in about the fourth grade where they were told to write a letter to their congressman and senator, and that's it. Now let me tell you something: Politicians have all figured that out. Politics is just like sports: The easiest way to win is if the opposition doesn't show up to vote. In politics you're trying to highly discourage the opposition so they don't vote. It's been working pretty well. Have you been looking at our voter turnout? One of the things you do is when people write in, you don't answer if you don't like what they have to say. If they call in for an appointment, you don't have time to meet with them on those kinds of silly issues, those flakey issues. But after all, the congressman's important. What happens? Then you start saying: "Well, those sons of guns. They're not worth anything. We pay their salary; we can't get a real response out of them; they won't talk to you." Right? Then people say they're going to drop out. That's exactly what they want you to do! So move your political science to the next level.

Remember what you learned a little later on? You learned empowerment and how you boomeranged them back and got their attention. I remember I learned it in college. Thank goodness, I went to a public institution that was very, very politically minded. We were taught that the first day we walked in the door. We were constantly at war with our legislature. So what we would do is anytime we had a huge fight with the legislature, we would put up a registration booth, right there on campus, and all the ones that we were disagreeing with, we would do registration in their district. Then at the end of the day, you would just write a note: "Dear Congressman, Senator or Assemblyman, we think your position on this stinks and today we registered 300 students that live in your district that agree. See you in November."

We did another thing. We had every single student's home address, and then we put it in a computer and we added into the computer the editors of the local newspaper. If their local representative or their local senator was voting against the university there, we could have 300

students writing to the editors of the local newspapers: "I am a student of the university and I can't believe our representative just didn't follow it." Did the local newspaper jump on that! They'd be there taking pictures. "Here are all these poor students from the hometown." Why, I tell you, every single time (and the longest was ten days) we'd have those people on campus saying, "I don't know how you students got this turned around. I've always been on the other side of this; it must have been a mistake. I don't know how it happened but I want to tell you never again." That is empowerment, and we all learned it and we all somehow forgot it, or got discouraged or dropped out. So tell people to stop dropping out and drop in. Register, figure out how you empower the people around and give them a sense of hope. Let's get this thing moving because heaven only knows we need it. The statistics show we need it; everything shows we need it; and we really have waited too long already. So let's not keep waiting and say it's a nice idea. This is a needed thing that must be done. We can tell you where the thoughts can come from; we can tell you how to do it. Just do it.

Thank you very, very much for letting me be here.

CO-CHAIRMAN BATES: We have the pleasure of having Yolanda Nava, who's a reporter for KCBS News and formerly in Sacramento, where she was an anchorwoman. Yolanda, thank you very much for agreeing to moderate this first panel, The Changing Family Structure.

MS. YOLANDA NAVA: The members of the panel are Lillian Garland, Jing Lyman, Jan Breidenbach, Ron Johnson, Jane Kelly Roberts, and Ed Zigler.

First of all, I am very pleased to have been invited to participate in this conference. Dealing with the issues of the family is an extremely important charge and the fact that you are all here is extremely critical to what's going to happen in family policy in the state over the next several decades.

Yesterday, I moderated a panel on women in L.A. County. The observation that I made then is perhaps one of the same observations that I could make today. After almost 20 years in the Women's Movement, we're still talking about pay equity, comparable work, the tremendous need for child care, issues of sexual harassment. Yet today, 20 years after the Women's Movement, and perhaps even more decades after we began looking at family issues and policies of this country, we're still trying to convince public policy makers in this county, in this state, and in this nation that we have to develop some kind of cohesive public policy with regard to families so the families which we cherish so much can be functional and create human beings which then can take charge of this planet that we live in and create a harmonious and peaceful world.

I continue to be amazed that we live in a time when we're still looking at myths instead of the reality, and I would urge you to look at some of the statistics in your folder, the fact that one in ten families meets the the traditional family image that we all grew up with in television. How do we convey that reality to the public policy makers who are deciding how our public funds are spent? Today all of you are charged with gathering together the information. We've heard it time and time again. There are public policy pronouncements; there are studies that have been done by government, by organizations. Philip Morris has done a study on family; Ethan Allen, the furniture company, has done a major study on family. We know what the issues are and the problem now is to translate the

reality into some kind of policy, and it's going to be up to those of you here to create that policy, deliver it to your public policy makers because they're not going to make it until you hand it to them. You have to tell them what you want and give them the direction. They cannot give you that direction. That's one of the things I hope will happen from this group, is that you walk away from here with the empowerment that Pat Schroeder was talking about. You've got to create what it is that you want, and you all have the ability to do that. That's why you're here. You care; you're concerned. You know the reality and now it's time to translate those needs into programs, into policies, into creating money to pay for the child care slots that we need in California. One million children in California don't have child care that need it. Half of the women with children under six are working. They need a place for their children. Half of all the families below poverty level in this country are headed by women, and those women are making minimum wage or $5 an hour. When you have to pay $400 or $500 a month for child care, how do you live? Pat Schroeder has touched upon all these things and you're going to continue to do that. Let's learn from what the panelists are going to say, some way of creating programs and policies which can then be implemented.

First we have a really exciting panel here today with a great deal of information. We have pioneers in the fields of family issues. Our first panelist is Jing Lyman with the HUB Corporation for Enterprise Development; she's involved with Ventures for Women's Enterprise, which is a moral national program designing economic development programs for low-income families. We're going to hear the national overview first, and then in Los Angeles from a local perspective, with Jan Breidenbach.

MS. JING LYMAN: Thank you, and thank you for your fine program too. I'm really very pleased to be here. Last year at the hearings in San Francisco, stunning conflicts were made there, described as the "Aging and the Younging of California." There are, of course, major exceptions to that, that is, the affluent middle, upper-middle class, white, anglo population and the young multi-ethnic, multi-minority, low-income population. However, California is taking the initiative to address this dichotomy at these legislative hearings. Initiatives are going on all over the state, and they're addressing the realities of the dilemma and proposing new legislative measures, new policies and new practices that will bring about positive change. We in California -- and I consider myself to be a Californian -- are the bellwethers for the entire country. You heard Pat Schroeder say that. We have the opportunity and the responsibility to address and ameliorate the split of old and young, rich and poor -- and I would add urban and rural -- through constructive policies and new initiatives that are vital to a full and productive work-family agenda.

What are some of the basic tenets of a comprehensive family policy? Not to change is to die. Not to recognize change is also to die. So I would recommend the broadest possible interpretation of family, including single parents, cohabiting members of the same sex, shared households, as well as blended families, extended families, and traditional families, two-parent families. I recommend tolerance for recognition of the value of diversity in age, in culture, in gender, in color, in religion, family style, and economic and educational levels and in today's context, recognition of the importance of economic self-sufficiency for <u>all</u> adults based on building and revising definitions of

capacity, not of dependency.

We have vast amounts of economic capacity that we are either not recognizing or not using constructively. Professor John McKnight at Northwestern University makes a strong case that we have developed an economic and social superstructure of people whose own economic self-sufficiency depends on the neediness and dependency of others. We have increasingly made dependents out of the poor by stifling their ability to make choices for themselves and by belittling their capacity to control their own lives. We need to help gauge the agendas and the opportunities for both the servers and the served. We need to understand and expand the new economic tools that are now being evolved to assist both groups.

Economic development and the economic growth it engenders is a profoundly human process. People, with ideas of how to combine inputs and new ways toward new ends, are the dynamic element in the economic equation, the moving part. We have only recently begun to look creatively at what that moving part is already doing and at how much more it might be doing with the right kind of recognition and assistance. Much of that moving part resides among people, family people, in the broadest sense, who have been locked out of our economic system, whether because of gender, color, age, physical handicap, sexual orientation, or simply because they are poor. We must find ways to provide that recognition and assistance for nurturing the levels of capacity in all people if we are to remain competitive in this increasingly world economy.

And I'm going to address the particular issues for women as this moving part for the following reasons: 61 percent of all women of working age are expected to be in the out-of-home work force by the year 2000. Women, especially low-income women and women of color, have an often unrecognized and certainly under-utilized economic capacity. The HUB process, the process which I helped to design for releasing of self-employment and job-creating resources among these women, is applicable to all constituencies that have been left out of the economic mainstream. And most important of all, as the world's caregivers, women impact, either positively or negatively on everyone. They're young, the elderly, and everyone in between. If women have the tools to become economically self-sufficient, everyone gains -- men, women, and children. The HUB process and the HUB tools are helping very diverse communities to recognize women's economic capacity and the initiatives to release it. I will leave testimony from the State of Maine that effectively shows this. Responding to the extraordinary initiative of a resourceful group of low-income black women in a newly incorporated California community, HUB is helping them to develop a self-employment and job-creation strategy to stabilize and expand their for-profit and nonprofit entrepreneurial experience for the economic and social "good of our community", as they say. Daily, these women are trying to cope positively with the community impact of violence, drug abuse, teenage pregnancy, school dropout, and political confusion. They understand the importance of planning for change, economic change. They know because they have run businesses and know that their initiative will require significant, upfront investment.

In terms of their own time and expertise, they have no money, sometimes not even enough to support their families. In terms of the resources from the many constituencies who stand to gain

from their efforts -- the churches, the city government, the educational institutions, a variety of nonprofit and government agencies, local developers, businesses, foundations in surrounding communities, and, of course, individual members of the community itself of all ages -- they understand and you must understand that such investment has to be seen as long-term investment, patient capital, that such investment will be very cost effective in both economic and social terms if they allow for that patience.

In terms of any traditional economic index, these women have less than no credibility, and yet their capacity and determination are breathtaking. We must encourage a true partnership between business and government at all levels and the community to give an honest equity position to these women of the community, including recognition of existing skills, their active role in planning, their access to appropriate levels of capital for technical assistance which will nourish the start-up and growth of their businesses.

The long-term return on this investment can be nothing short of phenomenal, and let me share with you an extraordinary model of what I mean. Believe it or not, it's from Bangladesh, the Grameen Bank, Bengali for "World Bank", broke all rules. It loans to some of the world's poorest people without collateral, and yet its default rate has been less than 2 percent. Aside from saying that it works on a group credit model, I'm not going into the details here of how Grameen Bank functions. What you should know here is that in 12 years of operation, the bank now has 328 branches serving 5,600 relatives. It has more than $54 million in loans to over 275 borrowers and its monthly dispersal rate is $2 million. But equally important, it has changed the lives of many of its borrowers, particularly the women, who now account for 75 percent of all loans in a country where they make up only 5 percent of the labor force. According to the bank's founder, Mohammed Eunice, and I quote: "Women make far better borrowers than men because they are so fiercely determined to include the lives of their children." Remember that; that's very important. He also says: "In the minds of theoreticians, poor people are helpless. To me a poor person is a forest. She has lots of unrealized capacity."

Creative ways to adopt the Grameen model are now being tested in Arkansas and Chicago. One of HUB's board members, Connie Evans, runs the Women's Self-Employment Project in Chicago and has been using a Grameen variation that they call credit circles. She now has state support to allow participating welfare recipients to keep their welfare checks and child care subsidies during their first year of self-employment. That's a major shift. I'm not pretending that self-employment is any kind of panacea; nothing is. Yet both Eunice and Evans would tell you, that having the choice to try your own idea, to overcome an engulfing lack of self-confidence because society has neither recognized nor allowed you to recognize your own economic potential, and to decide for yourself whether you want to be self-employed or work for someone else gives a woman a whole new lease on life, what I think Ron Johnson would call "her internal leadership." Leadership either lies stalled or is born from within, first in the individual, then in the family, then in the community. We need to recognize and encourage this type of leadership among women at all of these levels.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One creative model for use of new technology in developing such leadership in a non-literate, non-English-speaking population is the REFWD project, Refugee Women and Development, satellites and seamstresses. Started by a young woman from rural Maine and now run by an Afghan refugee woman, it used videos of Hmong women to teach other Hmong women in isolated refugee locations how to produce their native crafts for sale through live, interactive video tele-conferences. Call it alien technology. These women were able to achieve a sense of belonging and a new sense of self-confidence. Some sense of economic control allowed them to move forward on other fronts.

We now have a very interesting array of models to release this type of economic capacity, but models really only work as adaptable processes. The Grameen Bank model of group credit apparently doesn't feel right to some reservation Indians. What works in Chicago may or may not work in Los Angeles. We know from HUB's experience that what works in Hartford, Connecticut, will not work the same way in Newark, New Jersey, nor in San Francisco, East Palo Alto, or Los Angeles. The basic components of the process can be used and the basic issues for women all over the world and of every description are the same. But the process must be adopted by local people, especially involving the women by and for whom it was designed to fit local opportunities and to meet local needs. There must be local ownership of the strategies used to adopt the process, and that is precisely what has happened here in Los Angeles in a very creative and committed group of community leaders who have taken ownership of the HUB process with some very interesting results which my colleague, Jan Breidenbach, will share with you shortly.

But before she does, I want to close with a quote from the chief of the Cherokee nation, Wilma Mankiller, which epitomizes how and why people are the most important economic tool in today's new families. Wilma says, "Everybody was a leader and they felt it. The whole idea was to rebuild whole, healthy communities within our nations, and you do that by building people. When they first started out, they said, 'We can't do that; that's too hard; we'll never be able to do that.' At first they began to do one little thing and then another little thing and another little thing like that. They began to look at themselves differently and that's what's important; that's been a lasting thing."

We must give people options to do those lasting things for themselves in relation to both work and family.

MS. NAVA: Our next panelist who will be speaking to us is Lillian Garland, the woman who was brave enough to take her case to the Supreme Court for parental leave.

MS. LILLIAN GARLAND: I'm so happy to see all of you here. I think that we should really begin by giving ourselves a hand for being concerned enough to come out. I think we should give our representatives a hand because I thank God for them. I really do. We really need more of them.

In October of '78, I started working as a receptionist for California Federal Savings and Loan. I worked for this bank as a receptionist for about four years, and then I discovered that I needed to take maternity leave. When I informed my supervisor that I would need to take leave, one of the things that she asked me was, "Well, when will you be returning?" I said, "Well, let me check with my doctor and I'll bring you a note."

Well, my doctor gave me a note that I presented my supervisor. They gave me a maternity party, and I went on maternity leave. I took the time that the doctor gave me, which I believe was about eight weeks to have my baby. I had a baby by Caesarean section. As a matter of fact, I returned to work, one day early. I was so anxious and ready to get out of the house and get back to my job. When I reported to personnel and said, "I'm back and ready to go to work," I was told, "Well, Miss Garland, we no longer have a position available for you."

My question at that time was, "Well, what happened to my job that I've had for four years?" They told me, "Well, we hired the young lady that you trained in your place." I was devastated. When I asked, "Well, what am I supposed to do now?", they said, "Well, you can look for another job; or if something else comes up, we'll give you a call." At that point I remained in such shock. Once I regained my senses, I said to myself, "This does not seem right. There should be something that I can do about this. I've been a loyal employee to this company for years. It doesn't seem fair they can do this to me because I chose to have my child. I chose not to have an abortion; I chose to have my child."

Then I went to the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, and I explained to them everything that had happened. I said, "This doesn't seem quite fair. Isn't there something that I can do?" And they said, "Miss Garland, you certainly can." This began a five-year legal battle that went all the way to the Supreme Court. We won, so I guess on the state level it gives women the right here in California to take maternity leave. This isn't enough. We need to have a national policy.

I don't think that a woman should be penalized for having a child. My feelings are that God placed women here to reproduce. Somebody had to do the job; I mean I don't think men want to do it. Why should we be punished for doing a biological function? Why should we be penalized by having our jobs taken from us? At many times during that five-year battle, I had people talk to me, and once somebody asked, "How do you get the strength to fight like this?" When I said, "Well, I pray and God is with me and he's making me strong," they said, "But don't you realize what you're doing?" I looked and said, "Well, I think so." They continued, "You're one, small woman alone, one small black woman," as if I didn't know that. "You're going up against the Chamber of Commerce, the Merchants and Manufacturers Association. You are going up against Corporate America." Then I said, "That may be so but God made the Chamber of Commerce; he made Corporate America and I believe in this issue. I'm right and he's with me."

Winning this case was nice but it's not big enough. What we need to do is join together, write our local representatives, because this is not just a woman's issue. This is a family issue. I can remember when bread was 25 cents a loaf and I may be telling my age. What is it now? $1.25? What I'm saying is that it takes two incomes nowadays to build a strong, economic family foundation. I can remember one time I was flying to Sacramento to speak. The fellow sitting next to me on the plane said he was getting ready to become a father soon. He was from Canada and he said, "You never really stop to find out how the different policies affect you until your time comes, and now my time has come for this particular one." But he said, "In Canada, we have our parental leave. We have these policies and I don't have to worry about it. It's really sad that you don't have them over here.

You know, the continuation of a strong family is the continuation of a strong nation." Do you agree with that? You kill the family and you kill the nation. You chop its legs off and you make it weak.

I think family is so important; babies are important. Babies become doctors, lawyers, judges, presidents, assemblymen. Babies and children are our future and yet in this country, we don't have the protection that we need and it's sad. The only way that we can accomplish this is if we all join together. Write your representatives; let them know how you feel. If you do nothing, if you sit back and you're quiet, nothing will get done. They're here for you. All you've got to let them know is what you want. This is so important. Here in the United States, we're pro-mom, apple pie, and the flag, but we don't have anything to cover the family. I think it's about time that something be done about it on a bigger scale, a much larger scale; and we can do it. I'm here because I witnessed it. I'm one small person, yet I accomplished something by standing up and saying, "Hell, no, I won't take this." Do something about it. So, if I can do it, we can all join together and accomplish something.

MS. NAVA: Our next speaker is someone you will find very exciting in terms of what he has to say. Ron Johnson is with the Youth and Family Center in Lawndale, California, and he is a leader in the movement to improve the lives of teen families with job preparation and improved parenting skills. We know that teen families are one of the fastest growing families in this country and they face unique and serious problems.

MR. RON JOHNSON: I would like to begin by making a few corrections. This morning I've been called a pioneer and I've been called a leader in the field. I think what I am more than anything else is a foot soldier. This is one of the few times I have the opportunity to publicly thank someone for allowing me to gain the experience with teen families that I've gained here in this state in the last three years. It's important for me to say that the pioneer and the leader in this field in Southern California is Gail Davidson. I don't say that to make life easy for me at work. I say that simply because it's true, that when we look at our state and we see that there are 50,000 young people a year on an average having children, and these parents are between 15 and 19. Of that number last year, 900 young girls under 14 years old gave birth to babies and the rate of young people having a second child is about 30 percent. Gail needs to be congratulated because she has established a model not only for the state but for the nation that says that if we're going to deal with the issue of teenage pregnancy, then the knowledge should be comprehensive and the prerequisite is that we absolutely care about the children, about the parents, and the infants. I say "parents" because all too often programs that deal with teen parents only deal with the infant and the mom. Again, I see it fitting that the Youth and Family Center erected the Teen Father Program.

To keep my comments short, I'm going to talk about some of the obstacles that young parents are faced with. One of the things that this young parent, the mom, has to come to face early in her life is that she may, in fact, be alone. If we can get her to acknowledge this and in some way accept this, it has an impact on her life, because then at 13-, 14-, 15-years-old, she has the strength to abandon the idea that some white knight or somebody in the big bands is going to come and rescue her, buy her a house and make her life easy. When she understands that she may, in fact, be alone, she then has to think about the way of organizing her life such that she can have those skills present

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in her life where she makes a life for herself and for her child. This is not to say that teen fathers or young fathers don't want to help their children; but it is to say that as a soldier on the front line, working with teen fathers, one of the things that I have seen over the last three years that is now being confirmed in some ways by research is the idea that work for a young man, employment of some sort, is linked to his assuming his role as father. We have seen in our program that when a young man comes through the door, and we offer him health information, parenting information, birth prep information he may not want anything to do with that because the one idea that he has been taught in his life about being a man and about being a father is that he's got to have employment; he has to have income. So we have learned that the hook, the thing that keeps a young man in our program, is that he knows we will work with him, to prepare him to find work, and then help him if he can't find work. The obstacles that single parents face, both the male and the female, is that they need comprehensive programs that will allow them to stay in school and earn an income. Eighty percent of teen moms drop out of school because they can't find someone, an agency, to take care of the child while they're in school.

We like to say that the problems that are faced by people in this state are not going to be solved by funding. Well, teen parents need someone to help prepare them to assume their role as parent. Here I have to stop for a second. I had a terrible incident last night with a teen parent that I think I will point out all I've been talking about.

We service a population of young people who are really in trouble, and last night I found myself, once again, running in back allies trying to find a teen father who was hooked on drugs. Then I had the sad opportunity to go into the house and see four infants on the floor with the parents smoking cocaine around the children. That is why my tongue is tied this morning because I know that if we don't service teen parents, then we are really not seeing the outcomes. We're going to see the outcomes in their infants. That is why the Youth and Family Center that Gail has founded is so important, because it's through this agency that we can keep girls in school and help teen fathers return to school and find employment. It's through the agency that young people begin to believe that there are people who care about them to such a degree that they would work on their behalf, day in and day out.

We are faced with issues that confront young people that really beat them down. I've seen young people in the agency and young people outside the agency. I've seen young people who've received service and those who have not. What I see is that when young parents can come someplace where they are inspired to stay in school, inspired to find work, inspired to believe that they can, in fact, make it; then they do. However, to keep programs like this in operation takes money. If we want to rescue this very oppressed population, then we have got to organize comprehensive programs for young parents that, one, keep them in school, that, two, provide them with child care that is designed not to just warehouse babies and hold them on shelves but designed to teach children. We need to look at, in our state, the issue of housing in terms of young parents. We have young parents in our state who cannot afford housing; and that is going to be a problem in the year 2000 because the Department of Labor has said that 70 percent of young black men won't have jobs. If they don't have

jobs, they can't find housing; they can't take care of kids. Rather than live a life of pain around a child you can't take care of, young fathers walk away. They don't walk away because they don't care; they walk away because they can't cope. Services need to be designed to allow them to grow into men and women who are skilled to take care of infants, to take care of themselves, to take care of their family.

I must apologize to you. I am usually looser with my tongue.

CO-CHAIRMAN BATES: Well, Ron, the good news is that you testified before our committee and we actually have it all on videotape.

MR. JOHNSON: Before I sit down, I'd just like to say that teen parents need our compassion; they need our help. I might be out of turn by saying this but I have been working in an agency that I think is doing a fantastic job. At the same time, we have just learned that our school board has dropped the program for child care. I'm going to step out here on my own and say this because I feel strongly about it: This Task Force has shown me that there are people in politics who are less concerned about politics and more concerned about policies that are aimed at problems. I think we need that on all levels of politics, school boards, in this assembly and in Congress. We need more people like Tom Bates, more people like Miss Diane Watson who are concerned with policies for progress as opposed to politics to oppress.

MS. NAVA: I hate to tell you something, Ron, but a foot solider no more. One of the things that happens is that we do tend to think of ourselves as foot soldiers. Yet the minute we start speaking out on behalf of something that we care about and that we're committed to and that we want to make changes for, we do become leaders, and you've just done it.

Going on, we have the other half of our presentation on the Economic Tools for Today's Family which imposes a very critical perspective -- the high numbers of teenage parents and the numbers of single mothers that are heading families. The economics just aren't there for them to have decent lifestyles and to provide the economic opportunities and other necessities for children. So we need to talk some more about economic tools, and to do that now is Jan Breidenbach who is also with the HUB Corporation for Enterprise Development.

MS. JAN BREIDENBACH: It's actually a little difficult to speak with that image Ron gave of those teenage parents and their children. It's hard enough to think of the teenagers but when you think of the babies with the cocaine, it makes you very angry.

I want to talk about child care and the need for a national policy from a slightly different perspective that I hope won't make people angry. It's not quite as dramatic as the image that Ron gave us, but I think it's an important issue and an important way to look at it. Our coalition, which was organized originally by HUB for Ventures for Women's Enterprise, is now the Coalition for Women's Economic Development in Los Angeles. It was formed about a year-and-a-half ago. In the beginning, the Coalition was looking for the type of project that they wanted to involve themselves in. Since it was a coalition with predominantly women members, the issue of child care certainly came up. They decided to do a project that would focus on family care. To make sure that you know what we were talking about, a Family Day Care Enterprise is when a woman (it could be man but I

haven't found one yet) provides child care in her home. In the State of California, you can be licensed to take care of six children. With an assistant, you can take care of up to 12 children in your home. Now most family day care providers are either licensed or unlicensed. There is a licensing process in the State of California, but many function as unlicensed family day care providers, the child care workers.

What we wanted to do was to look at family day care and create a model which would help women who do this type of work improve their economic liability. We wanted to improve child care but we also knew, from some research that was done partially by our coalition and, by a resource and referral agency concerning the income of family day care providers, that they don't earn much money. They earn between $8,000 and $14,000 a year on the average and it can go lower than that. Yet they are a vital component to the child care system in this state and probably in this country. Family day care providers take care of very small children and there are not a lot of centers that do that. Most centers will take care of children who are two-years-old and toilet trained. If you're a mother with a baby, you've got to go to work. Lillian Garland was telling us she had to go work. She showed up a day early. Someone had to take care of that baby and most centers aren't going to do it. They also provide care for after school. There are not many programs for after school. They've been cut, cut, cut. There's a lot of women who take care of after-school kids in their home. One of the more important things that we found out about family day care is the continuity of care. That's why family day care is so important.

Pat Schroeder gave her statistics earlier about criminals in the penitentiary who had not had proper bonding; family day care provides a continuity of care that is special and that makes infant care so vital. Family day care providers generally don't get up and go away, even in centers. One of the problems that many child care centers have is the shortage of staff; they can't afford to pay enough money because of the high turnover. Children in those centers, where there is a high turnover, lose the bonding, but the family day care provider can usually give the continuity of care that you want for your child. So both licensed and unlicensed providers are the child care choice for many, many parents.

We looked at Los Angeles family day care providers. They tend to function on a 75 percent capacity, which means that although they can take care of six kids, they often are only taking care of four. By the way, their own children, if they have them under 12, are included in that. They don't get paid to take care of their own children. When we looked at how much they earned, we found out their income wasn't very much, as I said before. Then we looked at models to provide some new information to help these women earn more money.

The list of things that we did is in the written testimony and anybody can ask for it afterwards. We looked at every project we could find in the country; and at every model available. We looked into how to get better referrals for them; better training so their quality of care would be improved; and discounts for things like insurance. There's a crisis in child care right now with insurance, and that crisis has doubled for family day care providers.

I was in this room just a couple of months ago for a hearing for the State Insurance

Commissioner on liability insurance and child care. Sitting right up here at the table was a family day care provider who was earning $6,000 a year. All she was asking was permission to pay her $300 a year liability insurance bill over time. Somebody on that commission (unfortunately, I don't remember his name because he should be humiliated) stood up and said, "But that's only 5 percent of your income."

Even though that man can add, subtract, and divide, I don't know if he realizes that $6,000 a year to live on is not enough to find $300 to pay for your liability insurance. So there is a crisis. We decided to look for ways to find the discounts, ways to help these women in any way we could. Well, we spent months looking at every project, interviewing every child care project we could find, improvement projects, everything. We looked at revolving loan funds for their insurance, at loan funds for toys and equipment, and at ways of putting people into cooperatives so they could get health insurance. Because family day care providers probably can't afford their own health insurance, we thought they could form cooperatives and get group benefits and health insurance.

The conclusion we came to is that every single thing we could do would definitely improve child care, but at best, we would only incrementally improve the income of family day care providers. It's not a big surprise but our conclusion was that child care in this country is subsidized by the providers. So family day care is subsidized by the family day care providers, those women who are taking care of our children in their homes. At the end of our research we decided not to go ahead with this particular project, primarily because the focus of the coalition is to build economic development projects; and this particular one did not fit.

Finally, I would just like to read the conclusion of our report. Having determined to focus on the business of family day care, the coalition, with assistance from HUB in New York, did spend a number of months reviewing child care projects all over the country. We concluded that family day care is a vital component for the child care system, providing a home-like atmosphere where children, particularly very young children, can be well cared for. We looked for every angle that we could find, every program we could think of that would permit us to build a project that would increase the profitability of low-income family day care businesses. We discussed going ahead with some version of our project even if it duplicated some of the very good work of the resource and referral agencies. Many of the things we looked at were already being accomlished by resource and referral child care agencies. Simply stated we believe that anything that improves child care, gets more child care, and even incrementally improves the lives of the women who do it, is worthwhile. However, no matter what we did, today's policy environment in the United States would take the burden of subsidizing child care away from those providers. No project, no program would ever change that. Ours is a society that does not value but actually belittles the experience and essential qualifications for effective child care. It is impossible to transfer these skills to higher paying jobs. Very often, if you are a child care provider, you might be able to become a teacher's aide. But does that mean you're going to go someplace else? No. They don't say, "Well, you've taken care of children for 15 years; you know a lot. We're going to hire you to do all these other responsible things." Child care providers don't get that chance.

While it is clear that family day care is definitely a method for escaping the worse ravages of poverty, women who want to be self-sufficient need more than that; they need more than a first step. They need models that motivate them to reach the second, third, and one hundred steps of economic development. Family day care is a small struggling business; it offers a model to quality child care but does not offer a model for economic profitability. Women who are low income when they start a family day care business will still be low income when they retire. As we stated several times in this report, child care in the United States is subsidized by the providers. Private-sector entrepreneurship cannot, will not, and never will change this situation. We cannot look to the private sector to resolve the crisis of child care. As our system now stands, small new projects can improve the lives of a few providers but only incrementally. What is needed, and we know this is no surprise, is a national public policy that takes child care as seriously as it does education. We must look at children from birth to adulthood as a national resource. That is the issue! Let's be realistic. Compare it to education. Even though we know that education is considered an important issue, it's not getting the attention it deserves. What we're saying is that if child care isn't treated at least that importantly, we're doomed.

MS. NAVA: Thank you. We now come to our final panelist. He has been a leader in the forefront of developing child care and child development programs which is one of the things that Jan was just talking about, how to realize that children are our national resource and how to make their early years of growth ones of development, which will foster and provide them with the tools they need to survive in this society -- really make them worthwhile human beings. We can barely get by now with what we're doing with our throwaway babies and the ways we handle so many children as they come into the world. If we look at the prison studies, we find that about 80 percent of those in prison were abused or neglected as children. So it all relates. Whether we pay for it up front with child care and early childhood development or teen parenting programs, we're going to pay for it at the other end at $30,000 a year per inmate in prison. It's about $3,000 to educate a young child and it's $30,000 to keep somebody in prison, in addition to the cost for drug abuse and other programs like that. So the costs are there at either end of the scale and it's a matter of where we're going to place our priorities. That is the charge for the public policy makers that are here is to figure out how we're going to go about doing some of that.

Just an aside, about the insurance issue. In the process of developing some of those insurance form packages, has anyone explored insurance companies' responsibilities in terms of child care coverage? They're not all separate issues and so I ask the question: "Is that being looked at?"

Our speaker now is Ed Zigler, Director of the Yale Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy and he's going to be talking about helping parents work and children prosper.

DR. ED ZIGLER: Thank you. Good to be with you. Patricia Schroeder was, of course, right on target with her remarks that the basic building block of any society is the family. The fact is that the family in America today is in some trouble. That building block is not as stable as we would like. We have studied families, and we all come to the same conclusions. Many families are characterized

today by a sense of desperation. Families who are just barely feeling they're well off suffer alienation. We have a simple barometer of how well families are doing. Child abuse. We are now living in a society in which we have 2 million cases of child abuse each year. We have studied this sad phenomenon and are perfectly aware that the basic determinant of child abuse is stress. Anything that increases the stress on a family increases the prevalence of child abuse. Anything that you do to decrease the stress on a family decreases child abuse.

Now families have been changing. That's why we're meeting here today. I can't burden you with many demographics but you must know some. The most important demographic change over the last 20 years has been the increase in the women in the out-of-home work force. Sixty-five percent of women with school-age children are now working; 55 percent of mothers of preschoolers, are working. Among the babies under one year of age, 50 percent of the mothers of those infants are working. It hasn't stablized yet. We're looking at a society which, at the turn of the century, will see 75 to 80 percent of all women in two-parent families in the out-of-home work force.

Please do not accept the shrill cries from the far right saying that this reflects that awful Women's Movement, that they've all been brainwashed. The fact is that women are working today for exactly the same reason men are working, economic reasons. We've heard, and I would underline the fact, that we are now living in a society in which it takes two incomes for a family to have a moderate level of life. One further number: Two-thirds of the women who are in the out-of-home work force have a husband who's making less than $15,000 a year. We have another phenomenon -- this will be my last demographic -- children are growing up in single-parent homes. There have been two reasons for this huge increase. One, of course, is divorce; the other is the growing number of women, usually young women, who are having babies out of wedlock. Now there's some good news on the divorce front. It seems to have stabilized as it's been going up through the years. Unfortunately it stabilized at a very high rate: 50 percent of the marriages that take place this year will end in divorce. As a result, today in the United States, 25 percent of all children are being raised in a single-parent home and about 90 percent of those homes are headed by a woman. Among our black citizens, that number is now up to 52 percent.

Some ten years ago, my colleagues in the child and family field were writing off the family. It was doomed; it was dying. The American family will not die, nor is it doomed. The new family that you're seeing in America can succeed if they have the proper support systems. Probably the single greatest need that families today have is child care. There are three major determinants of what a child is going to become. I've studied children, their growth and development. The most important determinant is the quality of the family and how the family behaves. Secondly, is the school system; but a very important determinant of the ultimate growth and development of children today is what type of child care the child receives. Most babies playing on the floor as their parents smoke cocaine are almost doomed in the cradle. So it's the care of children, both by family members, by the school, and by child care which will determine what kind of citizens we have. It's more than a family issue. It's a social issue; it's a productivity issue. What kind of employee will we have? How competitive will we be as a nation? What has happened in this country is really something of a tragedy because

what we are seeing everywhere, and I guarantee you have it here in Los Angeles, is that a two-tier child care system has developed.

We in the child development field and early education know how to provide good quality child care for children of every single age, care that will optimize the development of the child. We are finding that affluent families who are aware of this fact know that when they buy child care they're not buying a service that permits a mother to work; they're buying environments that determine the growth of their children. They go out and pay for and select very good child care that guarantees their child's success. Unfortunately what we're seeing is that the poor, the near poor, the working class, and even the lower-middle class are purchasing care of marginal quality. They simply cannot pay any more. They couldn't even manage that if the care was not being subsidized by poor women or just slightly poorer than the people buying the care.

There is no question in my mind (I track the system and have done so for 30 years now) that today in the United States we have hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of young children who are receiving child care that is compromising their optimum development. I agree with the thrust of the former speaker: This nation must move as a nation to the view that good quality child care, like education, must become a right of every child in America. Thus in trying to deal with this issue, I have invented what I think is the long-term solution to America's child care problem.

I have been scurrying back and forth to Washington for over a quarter of a century now and was once a federal official there running the Head Start Program and other programs. I know what's going on in child care today in Washington and I'm working with all of the ABC bill people, with the Hatch people. I'm not holding out great hope for the federal government to solve the child care problem. My best bet is that this problem will only be solved at the state level. We have to turn this problem into a state problem, because child care, like education, is not mentioned in the Constitution. It's finally a state issue. This does not mean there's not a role. They will do the research; they will subsidize very poor families. But please be aware here in California that if something good happens, it's going to happen because your State Legislature makes it happen.

Now what I may envisage as solving the problem of child care is the school of the 21st Century, which is only a few years away. I see two systems in a school building. Remember, those school buildings represent a $2 trillion investment on the part of taxpayers. We should be utilizing them more fully. I see two systems in the school. The first system is the formal schooling system that you all know about. The second system will be a child care system. That system will be one in which children, 3-, 4-, and 5-year-olds, will have available to them not formal school but good quality child care all day long. The child care system in the school building will open two hours earlier in the morning and will be open two hours later in the afternoon to fit the days of working parents. Now half of the child care problem needs of America are for school-age children. So what we must have in this child care system in every school building is before-and-after school care for children from ages six through twelve and vacation care during the summertime. However, as our earlier speaker mentioned, child care is a problem from birth to at least age 12. The minute the child is born, somebody from that school, the child care system in the school, shows up at the home and becomes a

supportive visitor to the mother. If that sounds like "pie in the sky" to you, let me point out that this program exists in every school district in the State of Missouri. It's called "Parents as First Teachers". One of the things that the program does is exactly what Congresswoman Schroeder was talking about. They screen children very early to see that they get help as soon as possible. It's a wonderful program and that would be part of the total child care system.

The second outreach program is very important. The previous speaker is right on target. If the system is going to start at three, where are the children from zero to to three? The fact is that 70 percent of the children from zero to three are in family day care that you just heard described, a woman who takes in four, five, six children. That system is very heterogeneous. It's a cosmic crap shoot. If you knock on the right door, your child is with wonderful care; if you knock on the wrong door, your child may very well be in very serious danger for his physical safety. We have to put a floor of quality under family day care. Those years from zero to three are terribly important. As we just heard, we have to support those family day care mothers who receive very little support. What I suggest is that you take all the family day care homes around the school, combine them into a network, put the hub of that network in the child care system in the school, which then monitors, supports, trains and helps the family day care mothers.

The third and final piece to the school of the 21st Century child care system would be the information and referral system, where a mother in the neighborhood around the school could go to the school to get help in finding night care and a variety of other needs that families have. This, of course, would be tied in very quickly to the California Resource and Referral system. It just brings them closer to families. To make that system cost effective, I would like to see it in the hands of people trained in early childhood and in family support, that is, those who get degrees in early childhood education. We also have another resource which are child development associates; these are local people who are certified on-the-job after demonstrating their ability to deal with children.

Now who pays for this system? The cost is huge and let's not belittle the cost. The first bulk of the cost will come from fees paid by parents. Parents are already desperate. If they would have a reliable, safe place for their children that's not going to go out of business, is not going to wind up sick, a place they trust like the school, they'd gladly pay fees to the school. Of course, the fees into the child care system ought to be calibrated to family income which means that families at every level will have to subsidize child care for the poor.

Now what are the developments in the school in the 21st Century, which I just announced to this country some four or five months ago? It seems like an idea whose time has come. It's moving very rapidly. We have another bill before the Senate, and I ask for your support in that bill. It was introduced by Senator Dodd, just as the ABC bill was introduced. What that bill asks for is something the federal government can do. Will the school that I envision work? This bill would spend $120 million for each of three years, give that money to the states and allow local schools who want to do this kind of a model to have the money to do it. That bill is picking up support and I would appreciate anything that you can do to move it along because some of that money will wind up here in California so that you can start some of these model schools here. It's called the School Reform Act and I'm

sorry that I don't know the bill number.

Now I'm very proud of my own State of Connecticut where we have a child and a family policy champion in our own Senator John Larson and Senator Joe Parker; I'm delighted to be here with both of them today. Naturally, since I'm from Connecticut, I would like to do everything I can to make Connecticut a model of what the country should be. Under the leadership of these fine senators, a bill has been introduced in the state legislation which provides the supportive funds to start three of these schools. Recently I was in Montgomery, Maryland (which is important because it's right outside of Washington), and they also are planning some of these schools.

Now I've seen the future, and of all places, it turns out to be in Missouri. I just visited there two weeks ago. Missouri today has 12 schools of exactly the kind that I've outlined to you. They are located in Independence, Missouri, and are quite common. You don't even need the state, it turns out, if you have a superintendent who really believes in this. People who see that good quality child care and education are synergistic (and you need both to produce a good human being) just move ahead, and they moved ahead there. They're planning to write a manual on how to start these schools, which will be very useful to people who aren't as involved as they are.

Now the good news for Missouri is that since these schools sit in suburbs, the entire system is paid for by parent fees. In fact, they charge the middle-class parents a little bit more than the service cost and are able to subsidize a few of the poor parents that actually live in these suburban communities. So it turns out to be economically viable. Now let me not be a Pied Piper. If you do these kinds of schools in inner-city Los Angeles or inner-city anywhere, it's going to cost big bucks if you do it at the level of quality demanded to help children grow as optimally as possible.

When I sat with the school principals, we talked about giving the local people their own initiative. I don't see only a cookie-cutter solution. Every school doesn't look like every other school in Missouri. If you allow a principal in the area to take the leadership, they do all kinds of innovative things. One is putting a school next to the Boy's Club and using some of the services. Each one is coming up with innovative ways. It reminds me of the early years of Head Start, in which I'm one of the founders. We didn't tell everybody everywhere exactly what to do. We had certain principles that we said what we wanted accomplished. We trusted parents and said they've got to be involved early. The same idea underlies the school in the 21st Century.

Now California has often been the model for this nation. I'm particularly impressed -- and I don't impress easily -- about the latchkey program. I'm also impressed that California has broken ground in forming vocational programs for young people to develop skills to become child care workers. You will never have a good child care system in the United States unless you look at issues like trained people, paying them the salary that a human being caring for children should be paid, and giving them the status that they deserve.

Of course, these are the people that are part of any quality system. In fact, I came here today to ask my new friends in California to follow the lead of Missouri and Connecticut and provide the funds to implement a number of the schools that I've discussed. Let's see how they work. What are their funds? Let's try it. It's not a short-term solution. It won't take care of the child care problem

today, but it's a long-term solution and somebody's got to look 25 or 30 years down the track. Remember Missouri only had four of these programs. In two years, they went from four schools to every school in Missouri. Once parents see these schools and and see their value, then the parents in the next district will say, "We have to to have one of those schools." I see it happening. After leaving this meeting, I'll go to Florida. There, we'll be talking with decision-makers who are very interested in starting some schools. I see the movement towards the school of the 21st Century beginning, and again I request all of you here in California to be leaders in this development.

MS. NAVA: Why don't we take the opportunity to ask some questions of the panel members or whoever you want to ask questions of.

THE AUDIENCE: My question is to our state-elected officials. I think one of the things that we see here today is that our children are dying. On top of that, those who are in front lines fighting valiantly to protect and preserve our children and our families find that their spirits are crushed by the overwhelming burden of the conflicts and problems they see. What I am hearing loudly and clearly is that there is a vision catching fire, a vision of what minimally should be happening in our country today. What concerns me, however, is that at home, here in California, our homework has not been done. This vision will translate to departments, to bureaucratic structures, some of which are not ready to handle the precious vision that would be transferred to them. One of the primary obstacles that we confront today, for example, comes from the very Child Development Division that is to handle the child care policies that are being defined. That division, if it is not ready to receive our vision and the preciousness of what we're defining, will turn it into much less than what we have desired.

My question is: How can you help us so that those of us who have to deal with such structures do not encounter so many obstacles and barriers to service which add to the very problems that our kids are encountering?

MS. NAVA: To restate your question: You're saying that what we're hearing today is that our children are dying, that we do not have the policies in place to serve children, and that in addition, there are bureaucratic impediments to the vision which people here have presented which people in the country have with regard to what can happen to poor children and families in this state and this country; that we have these impediments in various state bureaucracies which are going to have to implement public policy and what can the lawmakers do to make sure that that vision is nourished and not crushed within the bureaucracy?

CO-CHAIRMAN BATES: Well, first of all, while you were restating the question, I had a chance to visit with my colleagues from Connecticut. They say, "This problem you describe is everywhere, in every bureaucracy, in every country. It's not unusual in California." That's the first thing. The second thing is, I wish we <u>had</u> the vision. As the coach here of the Changing Task Force on the Family, we're trying to <u>develop</u> the vision. We've been trying to break the nets this morning about how people envision the family in California. We're trying to point out, as Patricia Schroeder says, that nine out of ten women are going to have to work outside the home. We're trying to point out that our policies are not appropriate to the current realities. Then we're trying to build a vision

that will move to support the families. We're just underway with that. We're really discussing it now in this forum, in other forums and on television; we're trying to get the word out, to spark people's thoughts that we don't have it. I'm hoping that the Joint Select Task Force on the Changing Family will give us a vision; and we're trying to do that by September. We don't have much time. Yet we want to have the tenets on which a good family policy is laid. We want to have a function, as we just described earlier; we took a major step by defining a family by its functions and we're looking to see where we can support the families to do the job. So we're still working on the vision part.

As far as the bureaucracy goes, the a political situation in California is very complex in that we have a Legislature, which is Democratically controlled; the administration is Republican, and George Deukmejian's idea of what the Legislature had in mind for programs may be different than the Legislature; then compounding that, you have civil servants who don't care about either one of the two parties and they know what's best. Then there are the constituencies that want things implemented, maybe in different ways. So, the short answer to what we can do, is that you need to call upon your local or state representatives and say: Get in there and advocate for me. This is what we want. You ask them to contact the head of the Health and Human Services Committee or Agency and find out what's going on, why things aren't working. At least we can pressure them, squeeze them and go to their budget and say, "If you're not doing the job, we don't need these positions anyway." Now that's obviously very shortsighted because then you can never do it, and they'd probably be happy. They'd say, "Oh, great. Then we don't have to do it at all."

Then we've got a problem. What's most important in my mind is how to get the necessary help. We've been trying to get more inspectors to do toxic inspections, and we've been putting the people in the budget; we kept adding the inspectors, giving them staff and giving them lawyers, and then it would all be blue-penciled out or never filled by the Governor. You create a position that's never filled. What we need is a cooperative kind of situation. We don't have it in California; it's a political problem and a division problem; we need to work on all of it. So I probably may or may not have answered your question but at least it's a try.

MS. NAVA: Before taking more questions, I'd like to interject one thing. In looking at family policy issues, it seems to me that all people, regardless of their political persuasion, want for this country is the kind of nurturing and supportive environments for human beings that we hope we can produce, given the resources that we have in this great nation. Yet for some reason, politics, as you say, has entered into the picture; sloganering and manipulation, for whatever political purposes, has overrun what is taking place with regard to family policy. Somehow it would seem that those interested in making changes, those here, would have to figure out a way to de-politicize the process. As we draw up this vision that we have for children and for families in this country, let us create the vision in such a perfect and a harmonious way that there are no politics that can be involved in it except implementing the vision because the vision is an honest one and is a true one. I don't think anyone from whatever political persuasion wants to see those four children in a room with their parents ingesting some drug in their presence. Somehow we have to translate the realities out there to supersede the politics. I don't know how we do that except by truth and by continuing to push and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

project this vision that I think those people have presented here.

THE AUDIENCE: You've got a great idea when you talk about creating the vision. Let me add to it. The Seattle public schools had a family-life division headed by Ph.Ds in family life, and they were the ones who supervised the cooperative nursery schools. I'd like to see that family-life division in every public school system working with the kind of things that Ed Zigler just said.

THE AUDIENCE: Two questions on the economic side. To what extent must we focus on income maintenance, family allotments or whatever, which has been somewhat talked about in Canada, France, Tahiti? The other part of the question is, must we look at this problem from the point of view of a partnership between industry and business, child care centers, and so forth, and look at it in terms of the compensation package? That would involve unions. Thus, I have two questions: Income maintenance; I wonder if we're ignoring that as a solution. The other one, the partnership and the compensation package. I'm addressing my questions to anyone on the panel.

SENATOR JOSEPH HARPER: I would like to comment on the partnership part of that question. In Connecticut, we're getting better cooperation and support from our business sector or some of our family issues than we anticipated. One of the compelling reasons is that in the year 2000, it's been projected that we will not have a work force with the competency and literacy skills to meet the demands of our business and industry. Recently I was on a panel with Chamber of Commerce representatives in Connecticut and at the national level; they put it this way: "We're with you because family issues affect our own loss of livelihood of businesses in our own competitive situation."

DR. ZIGLER: You're right. Many countries have a "children's allowance". You don't have to go very far. Canada has it. The way it works is that if the family's affluent, then you tax the allowance away from them. It's a pretty good mechanism. We've had advocates for children's allowances in this country now for about 30 years. We have not moved in that direction. Part of the problem has to do with our ethos. We have an ethos which is a remnant of our frontier history that every family is utterly alone. You take care of your family; I'll take care of my family. What you see in other cultures is much more a sense of shared responsibilty for children and of commonality. After a 30-year effort on the children's allowance side, one becomes pragmatic and says there might be a better way to go; I don't see that as really politically viable in the current economic atmosphere.

Your second question about the partnership between the private sector and the public sector, especially around children, is a promising one but it has to be put in perspective. Remember that the solution of the Reagan administration for child care was that the private sector will take care of it. Let me give you some figures. There are 6 million employers in the United States today. We all get excited eyed when we find that there are a couple hundred places that have on-site child care. What I'm saying is that businesses are in business to make products, to be productive, to be competitive. It's a kind of monkey on their back to go to them and say, "Hey, we have a lot of children. Why don't you provide child care?" It's like pointing to business and saying, "We have a lot of sick people. Why don't you build hospitals?" I don't think it's realistic. On the other hand, they know that their own productivity depends on how good their employees with children are, which depends on their child

care. Their future depends on how good the children are going to grow up to be, which depends on the quality of child care. Businesses are trying to help. For instance, when I visited Missouri just a week ago, an early childhood educator was the head of the child care system in each school and a business had adopted a school and paid for that piece. We have many examples all over the country with Missouri just being one. Business is willing to help because it increases employee moral and productivity. We all have to find innovative ways. Senator Hatch has a bill which gives certain credits to child care activities by the private sector. Connecticut is trying the same thing. It's certainly worth examining, but my conclusion is to be realistic about it. Businesses are concerned about their bottom line and while they want to help with the child care situation they could not possibly be the ultimate solution. The ultimate solution is all of us operating through our government.

MS. NAVA: We also have with us Councilwoman Joy Picus with the L.A. City Council and she too would like to respond.

COUNCILWOMAN JOY PICUS: Regarding compensation packages, both the public and the private sector are really moving ahead in broadening what they offer to their employees in a very positive fashion. The City of Los Angeles is ready to receive a study that's been in progress for a couple of years. It looks at flexible benefits programs throughout the country, particularly for large employers. You'll see that leave benefits are opening up. Employees get a certain number of days a week. They can use it for vacation, for personal leave, to look after their kids, or whatever. It's not tied to very specific packages.

There is a wonderful program called a "flexible spending account" which allows you to take out pretax dollars to be spent for your child care. You benefit because it's pretax dollars. The company benefits because they also get a tax advantage. The tax revision almost destroyed it, but by the merest flick of a pencil, it remained in the program. It is an area that unions are indeed looking to, for increasing their membership, strengthening their support and then going ahead. There's a marvelous book called The Responsive Work Place by Sheila Cameran and Alfred Kahn, well-known sociologists and experts in this field. It not only looked at the variety of benefits that are offered throughout the country in big and small employers but how they work as well as what they look like. So this is indeed an increasingly important field. If you want to be on the cutting edge of change, right along with child care, alternative work schedules and leave benefits, flexible benefit policies are the way of the future.

MS. NAVA: One other issue which I think should become part of this record is one I discovered in reading the book called The Divorce Revolution, by Lenore Weitzman. She documents the fact that the equal distribution probably doesn't take into account the fact that most children live with their mothers, and as a result, the living standard of women and children drops 73 percent while the man's increases 42 percent within one year after divorce; so that the impact of divorce and single-parent families is extremely critical in terms of the economics. This is just one more fact which has to be incorporated into future public policies.

Empowerment is a very critical part of what we're all hearing, and we've heard what the data

are and we know what the condition of families are. It's going to be documented further as more testimony is heard and as this committee works to try to present its document and policies in September. But again, what is very critical to create is that vision because your public policy makers can only work with the tools and the information that is given them. It takes pressure, energy and input from the public to make the kinds of changes that are necessary here. I would urge all of you, as you leave the conference today, and in the next days and weeks ahead, to take the time to sit down with yourself and quietly go through the process of visualizing what is it that we're trying to create here; what are the goals that we have for children and families in this country; what kind of people do we want to produce; what kind of society do we want to live in? We have to figure out a way to help ourselves achieve that, and in the process of visualizing this, the answers will come. The public policy pronouncements can then be effectuated, but first that vision has to be clarified in our own minds. We can then bring it to the public policy makers, many of whom are extremely willing to act and be the leaders in implementing this on legislative boards. Then there are many other people who don't have a clue about what the problem is, and they need to be educated too; the many people that are here with us today are willing to do that and they need your help.

CO-CHAIRMAN BATES: Yolanda, thank you. Now I want to briefly introduce Senator Larson by saying that he and Senator Harper have been two of the main, key people in Connecticut to really do family policy. He's in the Senate and serves as the President Pro Tem.

SENATOR JOHN LARSON: Thank you very much, Assemblyman Bates, and to all of the distinguished members of the panel and certainly to everyone here. It's good to be here today and nice to travel from Connecticut out to Los Angeles. The very concerns that we're struggling with in our state are very much apparent here in Los Angeles as well. It is always a thrill and an opportunity to hear somebody as dynamic as Pat Schroeder speak. I agree and second what Dr. Zigler said to you: She is right on the money.

By contrast, I've had the opportunity to listen to Dr. Otis Bowen who is the Secretary of Health and Human Services. And Ron and Gail, I want you to know that he solved the problem of teenage pregnancy. He says that still the official policy is abstinence. As far as drug and substance abuse, it's just say "no". I think that's because if they get the two issues confused, you see, the same answer will suffice. These profound visionary statements by our leaders in Washington, I think, have caused us, especially in our state, to take a look at what needs to be done in the creation of a family policy.

In a recent Newsweek article entitled "The Clamor to Save the Family", they noted that specifically in Washington, there's more talk and less action to promote a sensible family policy. They added that real relief is probably a long way off. Newsweek neglected to take into account the strong and various activities of states like California and Connecticut, states that are ready and willing to take the kind of action that's neccesitated. California was referred to this morning as having been a trend setter for a long, long time. This kind of a task force gathering, public hearing, and establishment of the vision is exactly what is in order. I'm excited about the work that is going on here in this state to create economic and social policies that will make being a job holder and a good parent a brighter prospect in the future.

I'd like to thank Assemblyman Bates and Senator Watson, and President Pro Tem, my counterpart, President Pro Tem Roberti, for inviting us here and for the work they are performing on behalf of California citizens. California, as has been said earlier, is viewed across this nation, as a bellwether state, and it's willing to go out on a limb for its public. In part that's what this particular conference is about. I'm here today to tell you about what we've done in the State of Connecticut. I'll give you a little bit of background about our efforts. Connecticut is often referred to as the "land of steady habits". We are called "the insurance capital of the world". We are small but we like to consider ourselves equally as innovative. We have the highest per capita income in the nation, but our relative wealth doesn't always reflect what happens in our state.

Let me review a few statistics about our state and let us take a hard look at developing a comprehensive family policy. In Connecticut the medium income for a family of four is $39,000; yet one child in six in the State lives in poverty. In Connecticut 78 percent of those who are poor are women and children. As Dr. Zigler explained earlier, the single head of household is merely a euphemism for mother. Connecticut has the second highest child mortality rate in the New England region. Of Connecticut's 3.2 million population, some 500,000 homeless people will seek shelter on any given night. In Connecticut, and you heard Senator Harper talk about this before, by the year 2000, our Labor Department estimates that we will have some 300,000 people who are illiterate. This is the backdrop against which we constructed the beginning of our family policy. The genesis of that policy came about through a subsequent task force that looked at the areas of child abuse and pay equity with a recurrent theme -- that recurrent theme being women in poverty. As we explored that issue, we realized that if we were to address it effectively, we'd have to do so by addressing the issue of families that, in fact, as it's been said here several times today, it's not a woman's issue; it's a family issue.

It became very obvious in the course of our work that traditional government approaches in combating circumstances of our people were not working. In fact, more often than not, they are counterproductive. It was also obvious that our traditional approaches and the federal government were not working; and as been said several times today, still are not. We do not have a comprehensive program that seeks to integrate family policies in this nation. We have programs that are counterproductive. We need programs that buttress our families. The cornerstone of our family package in 1987 was a Parental and Medical Leave Act. This Parental and Medical Leave Act was effective for state employees, which numbers some 50,000 plus in the State of Connecticut; it allowed them up to 24 work weeks of leave without pay. That would cover situations that are related to the birth of a newborn child, the adoption of a child, and illness of a child, spouse, parent, or oneself.

Several have asked us: Why did you choose state government? We chose state government because we felt that state government should set the example. We have heard the concerns of the Chambers of Commerce and the small businessmen, and we have subsequently funded a corollary study; one, for which we are grateful to our consultant, the Yale Bush Center. As the State of Connecticut's Personnel Department develops parental leave regulations, the plan invites the business

community to come in and examine how the state will put this forward. Using the State of Connecticut as the model, using government as a leader, and having government set the example is the way that we felt we could best establish the needs of families.

Our comprehensive package was geared around the whole notion, that if you're going to have a successful family policy, if you're going to emphasize that families need to be economically self-sufficent, then you also have to emphasize that they need supportive services to attain that goal. They need supportive services especially in the area of day care, as Dr. Zigler has pointed out already. When we put our package together and passed some 16 bills through a special Select Committee on Family in the Work Place, it called for an increase in state support for the kind of successful program to continue to provide job training and placement for AFDC mothers. We didn't want to reinvent the wheel when we were looking at problems either, so we attempted to work with our state agencies. We helped displaced homemakers become independent through education, training, and job placement. Our Labor Department announced recently that we'll be affecting some 85,000 women who are seeing this kind of training and retraining. We brought day care subsidies for the poor and working class people more in line with day care costs. What was happening in the State of Connecticut (in terms of the comment that I made earlier about government running counterproductive) was that women were seeking to get off of the welfare roles. I know that may surprise many but they are actually seeking to get off those welfare roles. Yet when they sought support services of the State of Connecticut, they were receiving only $35 a week for day care costs. The average cost of day care in the State of Connecticut is $75 a week. Fortunately through our legislation this past year, we were able to change that. But you can see that when one approaches a family issue, it has to be done so in a comprehensive manner. Our program addressed the needs of several children's issues. With respect to teenage pregnancy, our program addressed housing concerns; it also addressed the needs of female inmates in Iantic Prison. It was comprehensive; it was broad based, and it's what we felt was needed in order to get the job done.

We recognize that even though Connecticut has been very aggressive and upfront with respect to family issues, that there's still much work to be done. In 1988, our second year of promoting the family policy, we have, and you've heard Dr. Zigler talk about it earlier, put forward our program that we are calling "Family Resource Centers". The program, of course, is modeled after the work of Dr. Zigler and we are very pleased and proud in Connecticut that we have such a talent and such a treasure in this man and his lifelong commitment to child development, not only in our state and this nation, but I dare say in the world. He is probably the world's foremost developmental psychologist as well, and we are indeed in his debt. It points out a direction and an opportunity for states to take. I am fond of saying that government is a collective enterprise. When government can work well with its academic sectors, it can produce worthwhile programs; and when government can work well with its private sector, it can produce worthwhile programs. This is what we need to do; this is what we set out to do.

You've been very patient. I know that many of you will have several questions to ask Assemblyman Bates and to ask us about our family policy. I have been joined today by Senator

Harper who you've heard from already. He is very much an architect and an engineer by virtue of the fact that he chairs the Appropriations Committee, which is the funding committee in the general assembly in Connecticut, as well as being joined by Fredrica Grey, who is the executive director of the Connecticut Commission on the Status of Women. Her tireless help provided us with much of the intellectual underpinnings that were so successful in putting forward a collective family agenda. I'm here today to start what I hope will be the continuation of the Connecticut and California connection. On October the 15th in Connecticut, we will be having a conference on families. It's my sincere hope that Assemblyman Bates and Senator Watson will join us there as well as President Pro Tem Roberti, and other interested agencies and people, not only from California and Connecticut but around this nation.

I sincerely believe that if we put our reason and resources together, there is tremendous room for compassion, especially as it relates to the development and ongoing nurturing of our families. We'll be here throughout the day to answer questions that you might have.

CO-CHAIRMAN BATES: Thank you very much. This afternoon, Los Angeles Councilmember Gloria Molina will be here discussing the problems of the multi-nature of our families. We're also going to look at whether our schools are doing the job and whether businesses are going to have kids that will be able to compete. After that, we're going to hear about some of the problems from the manufacturing and business sectors.

--- LUNCH ---

CO-CHAIRMAN BATES: It's a pleasure for me to introduce to you United States Representative, Claudine Schneider, who is a Republican and who represents part of Rhode Island. Do you represent all of Rhode Island?

CONGRESSWOMAN CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER: Half the state.

CO-CHAIRMAN BATES: She's in her fourth term; she's co-chair of the Congressional Competitiveness Conference and she's on the Select Committee on Aging.

CONGRESSWOMAN SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much for inviting me.

First of all I want to commend Elaine Zimmerman and certainly Assemblyman Bates and others for organizing this conference because this is the very kind of grass-roots, public participation effort that I believe has to be the core of any decision making that concerns the family. Who knows better about the family than the people who actually support the families and live in it. Also I want to commend my other East Coast colleagues here for their leadership in providing some policy changes and proposals and addressing the challenges that we're going to have in the future, that we have right now, as a matter of fact.

I know that all of you had the benefit of hearing Pat Schroeder this morning and I looked at your program. You had a number of different, very fascinating topics that have been covered. I don't want to be redundant, but let me share with you a few of my insights and I'm going to be brief so that you will have the opportunity to ask me questions also. I think that there are a few statistics that we

ought to keep in mind as we're looking toward the future of the family and what kind of government policy is emerging. Working mothers right now are the fastest-growing element of the U.S. work force. As a matter of fact, 71 percent of at-home mothers right now say that they would like to be working; and 75 percent of working mothers say that they would work even if they didn't need the money. I think those kind of statistics speak very clearly that women are in the work force now, that they're in the work force to stay, and there are growing numbers of mothers who are intending to do both their job outside the home and their job within the home. It used to be that women made 59 cents for every dollar that a man made and now we're making 64 cents; and our latest calculations are that by the year 2000, we will probably be making about 70 cents on the dollar. Well, you know, that's great if you like those kinds of slow time lags. As far as I'm concerned, we need to move those statistics as quickly as possible. The really good news, though, is that the figures for younger women are much brighter because women aged 25 to 34 are making now 78 cents on the dollar, and women aged 21 to 24 are making 92 cents on the dollar. Much of the effort has to be in recognizing that women occupy some of the lowest wage scales within the entire country, whether it be clerical workers or nurses, who unfortuately receive infinitely less pay than they ought to be receiving. What we see now are many young women who are entering the fields of computer technologies and getting advanced degrees in engineering, math, and sciences. That's enabling them to go for larger salaries through which they are able to make greater contributions to the famiiy income, whether it be paying for the mortgage on the house or paying for their children's education, or whatever. As we see more women working in non-traditional occupations, we're seeing the levels of pay and also the levels of status fortunately, but all too slowly, on the increase.

One thing that is moving us toward greater economic equity is attitude. You might think that sounds a little bit strange but let me share with you the results of a study. The MMPI is a standardized psychological test, and on one item you are asked to either agree or disagree with the statement: "I am an important person." In 1940, only 11 percent of women taking the test agreed with this statement: "I am an important person." In 1980, 66 percent of the women taking the test felt that they were important persons. My only question is: What happened to the other 34 percent? If today all women were to take that test, would we see that the majority of women do feel that they are important? I don't think that women themselves are empowered enough to understand that they are the ones that have to ask for promotion in the work place and for flexible comp hours and additional benefits as well; they are also the ones that have to seek public office and get to the inner cores of decision making in government. Unless we have greater participation on that part of society that makes up more than half of the working population, then we are not going to get the kind of equality and justice that we deserve. So it is up to women to make the first move. Further, the numbers of women who are running for local and state offices are on the increase over the last several years.

As a woman member of Congress, along with Pat Schroeder, I share enormous frustrations in that there are only 23 of us in the House of Representatives and 2 in the U.S. Senate. Despite the fact that I am a grass-roots person myself and wholeheartedly make every effort to stimulate grass-

roots participation, there is a crying need for greater involvement on the part of women in the federal government, in the House and in the Senate. I have to differ with Tom Bates when he said, "Things will change in Washington after this year." I've been in Congress for eight years now, and I can tell you that a lot of expectation is placed on the presidency. Everybody's waiting to see, and expecting that when we get a new president, everything's going to be different. The only way policies will change in Washington is if you change your Congressman and your Senators. I'm not saying that personally because I don't even know who represents his district so let's make that perfectly clear from the outset. Yet the fact remains that right now 98 percent of all House and Senate members are returned to Congress each election. If we continue to return incumbents to Congress, how can you expect to see a difference in policy? How can you expect to see any changes on any level, whether it be family policy or otherwise? When you change the man at the top, that's changing the person who is responsible for leadership, for vision, for communicating goals. However, it still comes down to the 100 folks that are in the Senate that vote and it still comes down to the 435 in the House of Representatives that vote. Many times on family, women's, and children's issues, we have found that the differences between success and failure are maybe 21 votes. That means we need to find out who is not supportive of our issues and of our priorities and replace them with people who we can guarantee will be supportive of these policies. Typically in a presidential election, you may have some friends who say, "Oh, I'm going to vote." Well, a lot of people only vote in presidential election years. In the off years only 34 percent of the American people vote. Now let's not forget that there are people around the world who are shedding blood, who are killing one another to have the opportunity to participate in the democratic process. Here we have this opportunity given to us and we are not participating. If you sincerely choose to bring about pay equity, if you sincerely choose to make sure that we have family and health benefits that are already established by the federal government, then the only way that is ever going to happen is if you change the House and the Senate and change those individuals who are contrary to that position.

The number of pieces of legislation that we do have going right now, are moving all too slowly, as far as I'm concerned. What we need is a little bit more help in Congress to move it more rapidly. I am also convinced, that as has already been shown by the Connecticut and the California example, that you can much more rapidly solve challenges such as this on a local level. That means Connecticut and California will have the enlightened government policies. Regrettably some of the other states will be left back in the dust unless we get a national policy. So, of course, we're all pushing for the national; but if you want speedy response for your investment of time and energies, certainly the local investment is very well placed. You have control and a greater capability of influencing the system through your local task forces and through your local leaders. However, you also have the power of control through the voting process in choosing those House and Senate members that will implement your philosophy.

Those are the only two thought-provoking ideas I wanted to share with everybody and I'll be happy to answer any questions.

THE AUDIENCE: How are you involving the local committees, task forces, commissions, that

have been formed by some of the local municipalities in this whole effort; and if you aren't, then would you consider doing that? The other question is whether your policy would include a requirement that cities form commissions to look at children's issues at the local level; also, if they will be receiving any funding from the state, then they would be required to form a commission at the local level.

CO-CHAIRMAN BATES: Good question. This is actually a hearing today that's being sponsored by the Senate and the Assembly and the Joint Task Force on the Changing Family is also sitting in as a party. So we have three parties: The Senate, the Assembly, and the Task Force. Today's hearing is being recorded and will be a transcript available for decision makers in Sacramento. The public document is available to anyone who wants it. The Task Force is involved in trying to get the vision, and in trying to come up with tenets for what a good family policy should be. The Task Force will make recommendations and will also be doing outreach publicity and presenting ideas to policy makers at all levels; then we want to move to implement those ideas. Your suggestion about working in these other areas and maybe requiring the local level to have certain kinds of committees and commissions is probably something that we can entertain as a task force recommendation. I appreciate that.

THE AUDIENCE: It sounds so far that the definition of family is parents with growing children.

CO-CHAIRMAN BATES: No, it's not.

THE AUDIENCE: Then you are also including the grandparents ...?

CO-CHAIRMAN BATES: Everybody.

THE AUDIENCE: Senior citizens?

CO-CHAIRMAN BATES: Yes. Well, as I said earlier, we're trying to have a vision of the family which is all five generations and they're all interconnected and interrelated to one another. We're looking at things about caring, about providing nurturence, security. We're helping with the functions that we all do, and I don't have it before me, but we have it all written out. The Task Force has agreed to it and we think it's pretty good.

Now, it's really a pleasure for me to introduce to you former Assemblywoman, Los Angeles City Councilwoman, Gloria Molina.

COUNCILWOMAN GLORIA MOLINA: I'm very excited about things here in the City Council. What I miss about the Legislature, though, is that we don't have the opportunity to work on the long-term issues of education, of changing populations, of families at the City Council; what we have is pretty much left to the jurisdiction of the State Legislature and they're doing a so-so job. Assemblyman Bates is well aware about how I feel; he has the same kind of feelings and sentiment that the Legislature has not operated as aggressively as it could on the issues of our changing population, understanding the true demographics of the State of California, including putting in place the proper public policy decisions in order to address that particular population. I know that Tom Bates has really struggled through every kind of process legislatively to try and get the State legislators to respect and understand those issues, and I want to congratulate him for having this public hearing and this meeting. He also has a very able staff; they're not only able but they're

equally as dedicated and persistent about some of these issues and that's how it all happened. I thank all of you organizers and all the people here.

Today's panel is addressing those very issues -- our changing population, our changing families, and changing student population; and we're starting to prepare the proper policy that is needed to address these very issues. We have some very exciting people with us that are going to be making those presentations, and I know that all of you in the audience will benefit tremendously from what they have to say. The only thing I would wish is that this room would be filled with legislators -- State Assemblymen, State Senators, and Assemblywomen, and Congressional Members who are in key policy positions and who could take the information that is going to be presented here, understand it, and then turn around and start legislating for those particular needs. Regretfully, not all of them are here. If I had another wish, I'd wish that all of you were State Senators, State Assemblywomen, and Congressional members because I know you respect and understand the kinds of challenges that we have before us in regard to our changing population.

We have various speakers that are going to be presenting today, as well as guests that they've invited with them. In a sense, we have the theoretical people and the practitioners as well so that we have the whole component together.

To begin with, we have a very exciting person from the State of California. He is someone who has been able to understand very clearly that you have to look at the demographics; you have to understand what the numbers are and the statistics; and you have to understand how to interpret those figures, how to make sure that it's a somewhat simplified process so that people who are making policies respect and understand those figures. He's someone who's been working for a long time in this area, a real expert in his field. He will be talking about California's changing demography, its implication for family policy.

I'd like to introduce to you Mr. Leo Estrada, a professor at the School of Planning and Architecture at UCLA.

MR. LEO ESTRADA: Let me begin by reiterating Gloria's comment that we are very appreciative of Senator Diane Watson and Assemblyman Tom Bates for this meeting.

I've been given a very short period of time to talk, and it really doesn't allow me to go into a lot of details. However, I think it's important to understand the signficance that California should be one of the few states that's taking the lead in trying to do something in terms of family policy.

It's been said that the family is an instrument that produces the conditions of living on a daily basis. The capacity obviously to produce these conditions is related to the resources that these families have available to them. When we look at California as a larger context within which families get all the resources, we can begin to understand the significance of the changing conditions in demography to family policy. We're about to end the 1980s, and at this moment the California population stands at about 26 million. We're the largest state in the Union. By the year 2000, we expect to have 32 million people. In fact, presently about one of every nine residents in the United States is a California resident. We're growing for many reasons, not because of birth rates; our birth rates are really low, extremely low in California, but rather as a result of migration and internal net

migration. As someone once said, "We are growing not only because people move here from Asia and South America but also because they move here from Indiana and Michigan." In fact, we gained about 1 million people just due to internal migration in the 1970s. We grew, though, by about 70,000 people per year due to legal migration and by about 50,000 a year, it's estimated, in terms of the permanent residents that come from the undocumented population. We are, in fact, a very highly minority state with 35 percent minority -- 8 percent black, 20 percent Latino, 1 percent American Indian, and 6 percent Asian and Pacific Islander. If California were, in fact, a nation, we would be the seventh most powerful nation in the world in terms of population, GNP, and wealth. By 1980 in our schools, as a whole, we saw ourselves moving beyond the 50 percent mark in minority population. We probably will be close to something like 53 percent minority by the year 1990. Probably, places like Los Angeles are likely to be at least 70 percent minority by the year 2000. Consider what the implications of that are.

Let me go very briefly to some elements that are important to understand. First of all, California is the quintessential baby-boom state. We, for example, have a very small proportion of elderly, and a small proportion of elderly compared to other states. Those born during the post-war baby-boom, which numbers about 5.5 million here in this state, make up about 25 percent of the California population. They are so large that they have, in a sense, shaped many of the policies around us. At the same time, despite this, there's another current going on which is that the smallest, third group of individuals, the youngest, for most people, is highly minority. At this point in time in the United States, fertility has been dropping. Child bearing among women has dropped to the point where we are actually not gaining in population due to fertility. Population growth in the United States now occurs mostly through immigration, although the the actual numbers of births are, in fact, increasing at the moment because of the number of women over the age of 30 who have postponed their earlier fertility. Yet even so at this time we average about 1.9 births per woman. In the late 1950s it was 3.7.

Teen pregnancy is one of the reasons why the births continue to increase. Presently one baby in every six is born to a teenage mother; one in two, to a black teenage mother; and one in five, to a Latino teenage mother. As a whole those births to teenagers are a growing proportion of all births. The most important thing, though, in California is the changing household and the profile of that household. Over half of all households in California, and the only state in which you can say this, consists of only one or two persons. We have the largest number of single adults, of one-parent families, of all states in the United States. It really comes down to a list of things, which I don't have time to detail, which would be something like this: Compared to the past, more Californians are moving away from their parents earlier. They're postponing marriage and child bearing or they're not marrying at all. They're having fewer children when they do marry and they're also experiencing a high rate of divorce. When they're divorced or widowed, they delay remarriage and then they live longer. As a result many of them maintain their own homes for many points along their life cycle and after retirement.

Another aspect of households which is important to understand is the importance of

immigration. We all understand the significance of legal immigration. We have a new law which is affecting the sources and affecting the results. Yet the most important thing is that California is the state that's most attractive to foreign-born people. Twenty-five percent of all foreign-born persons in the United States have selected California as the place to live. Therefore, the kind of impact it has upon us is much greater than in almost any other place. In addition to that, it includes not only legal migration and documented migration but also the fact that the United States has opened its doors to the 1 million refugees over the past decade. However, the main thing that makes us believe that immigration has to be considered as a signficant problem is the fact that the political, social, and economic conditions that have caused some of these large influxes in the past for the refugees and immigrants are certain to be continued as far as we can see in the Third World and in other continents. California, by all means, will probably continue to remain the preferred destination of most of these displaced persons.

Trying to put it all into some kind of a summary form is not very simple. What I'd like to do is cover some areas and briefly say a couple of things about each one, relating each, first of all, to changing demography, and then secondly, to the impact, in some cases, for the minority. Let's start out with work force. The annual baby boomers for the most part are now beyond the job-entry state. One of the reasons that child care has in many ways come to the forefront is because middle-class working women have finally had to face an issue of child care, which in some cases has been postponed, although the issue has always been there in minority communities. The new minorities, however, are new entrants into the job force. This is a time when the jobs are, in fact, declining in skills, when a number of good jobs are also declining, when the blue- and grey-collar work is increasing and when benefits that relate to jobs are also on the decline. In terms of productivity, we have to consider that we're also at a point in which we're demanding more productivity of our workers; otherwise businesses take their work to other countries or out of this area. We have more women, for example, having to accept jobs for wages that are low, without benefits and on a part-time basis rather than full time. This impacts the resources for child care.

The child care issues have been discussed all day today. I just want to point out that in 1980 52.4 percent of all women in California were in the labor force. That means that more than half of our workers are women; and therefore these issues are not minor issues at all. We expect that the 1990 census will find close to 58 percent of the California labor force being composed of women.

Youth is another issue which we have to consider. A higher proportion are growing up in single-parent families and a higher proportion will become teen parents. In California today, 27 percent of all of our residents are under the age of 18 and a very high proportion of that youth is minority. In terms of public assistance, many people a few years ago said, "We'll soon see a relief to the public assistance because the low-birth rates are going to decrease the need for higher allocations to that." In fact, these low birth rates are being offset by higher rates of divorce, higher rates of teen pregnancy, and low re-marriage rates which altogether come forth at a time when welfare reform is very much on the agenda with stricter eligibility rules and less money in many cases being given to eligible participants. Work fare is another issue for us that relates as well. Teen pregnancy, we

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

cannot get away from because we have a very large group of pregnant youth. We have one of the highest proportion of high-minority and high-fertility groups who are in the child-bearing ages or about to enter the child-bearing ages. It's an issue which has been intractable. People have looked at contraceptive use, programs of abstinence and programs of health and education to try to combat it. At this point, nothing seems to be working and it tells us that perhaps we should be focusing our energies on teen parenting.

In the area of social services, we see the shift towards age limits that will be discussed by Fernando Torres-Gil in a few minutes. However, the most important thing here to remember is that in the United States, in California and other areas, we have an anglo population that's aging and a minority youth that's more youthful, and the elderly costs more money. With limited resources, choices have to be made in terms of expenditures between the elderly and youthful issues. In terms of housing, California is the one state with one of the lowest rates of home ownerhship because of the affordability of housing. The demand remains high as the shortage exists, and perhaps the most important thing is that when you put together the high cost of housing and a very large number of one-earner families whose income resources are limited, we have a real crisis in terms of housing. In terms of education, we have a middle-class system that's had trouble adapting to the fact that its constituency is now a minority. The fact that education has not adjusted well does not forebode well for the future because it is the first step to a good job and income and all the things that are attached to the quality of life beyond that.

Finally there's internal migration. We should realize how high it is. California remains a very active and significant place of internal migration. A very large group of people come to California for its educational facilities. We have the highest group and highest number of people enrolled in undergraduate programs and universities than any other state. More importantly, many of those individuals decide to stay in California upon their graduation. We also have a very large group of individuals who are young, and the youthful population is the most likely to be mobile. In America we expect that there will be continued mobility, transition, and movement throughout the state, in and out of the state, and in and out of the country.

Lastly, there's immigration which I consider an overlay upon all the issues I've already discussed. Sixteen percent of all Californians are foreign born and that means that we have to deal with language, the cultural values, issues of immigrant adaptation, and even transnational families where part of the family is found on this side of the international border and another part found on the other side. All of this comes at a time when tolerance for diversity is somewhat in decline. Thus when one looks at all of these issues in which we have to deal with and which we must confront in California, and you add child care, its significance and relevance in terms of providing a healthy environment and a good and a better situation for women who work, women who are mothers, and for children who deserve better treatment, then we see that the challenge for California is great indeed.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: We have time for at least two questions. I'd like to begin by asking a question. If, in fact, we were to take the statistics and the figures as they are projecting and expanding each year, and you took the present political policy system that we have, let's say, for

health care, for education, for child care, what would be your kind of statistical conclusion for the year 2000?

MR. ESTRADA: One of the ironies of the growth that we've seen among minority populations is that it's not associated with a high degree of power. The reason for this is rather short term but it's very real. The reasons why minorities in California, particularly Latinos, are growing rapidly is because they're going through higher fertility than other women, and therefore there are children who have to wait at least 18 years before they're eligible to vote. We Latinos also have a very large number of immigrants; those who come with papers have to go through the naturalization process in order to be able to vote and some do, although Latinos have the worse record and rate of naturalizing. But the third group whom we recently uncovered due to the new immigration law are those people who are applying for amnesty. It's important to understand that under that law the earliest that anyone who applied for amnesty could become a citizen would be November of 1993. What it means is that we have a lot of people; therefore we're very visible; wherever you look, and even in our institutions, we are a constituency. Yet, in terms of our total power, it's actually eroding rather than growing. The only thing that makes it look less worse than it could be is the fact that we do actively involve ourselves in voter registration. In the short term, the situation does not look very positive. In the long term, we can all hope that people will indeed participate in the other parts of political institutions as well as they have, in things such as small businesses, the educational system or in institutions which have been important to us.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: Let's have two questions.

THE AUDIENCE: Is it true that by the year 2000, Latinos will be the largest group in Los Angeles County?

MR. ESTRADA: By the year 2000, Latinos are going to come very close to being the largest group. The only reason why it's hard to say it with certainty is that some of the areas with the highest Hispanic growth in the last five years have been in the surrounding counties -- Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura -- and therefore the growth that we have predicted is slowing down somewhat. At the moment, if we just take a look at the school systems and at the proportion that are minority, there's no doubt that minorities will, in fact, be the largest group in Los Angeles County, probably as early as 1990 -- in fact it's happened somewhere in the 1980s. We will become the largest proportion of all persons somewhat close to the year 2000.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: Mr. Estrada points out very clearly that we're dividing and we have more polarization between the haves and the have-nots, and there is potential for a crisis within our cities and our counties and certainly throughout the state. An important time to start addressing the kind of public policy we need to resolve that crisis is really today.

The next panelist will speak on "Aging in the 21st Century: The Need for New Family Policies". A good friend, and also one who is an expert in his field, Dr. Fernando Torres-Gil, is a professor of Gerontology and Public Administration at USC; he's also a former Staff Director of the U.S. Congressional House Select Committee on Aging.

DR. FERNANDO TORRES-GIL: I want to commend the Joint Select Task Force on the

Changing Family and Assemblyman Bates for putting on this very needed hearing. I also want to commend Congresswoman Claudine Schneider who is not only an advocate for the family but also an advocate and friend for the elderly. She is a member of the Select Committee on Aging. So it's a pleasure to have her here as well.

Today I will be talking about the aging society in relationship to the family and older persons. Essentially I will also make reference to the growing multi-culturalism which Leo Estrada has already discussed. But before I get into some of the substantive issues, it's important to clarify a few terms. If we are to reformulate family policies to also include older persons, those two terms include the word "elderly" or "older persons" or as some would like to say "mature" Californians, mature Americans and the concept of the aging society. Since 1935 we have developed a vast array of public benefits and programs ranging from Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, the Old Americans' Act, et cetera. They have one thing in common: They define eligibility primarily by age. If you are 60, 62, 65, you are eligible for those programs. Those age-based programs have been tremendous successes in providing many older persons with badly needed social, health, and human services. They've also been responsible for dropping the poverty rate among older persons, from a high of 30 to 40 percent in the '40s and '50s down to 12 percent. They provide older persons with a measure of independence and dignity and to that extent we should be grateful; we should applaud those decision makers that brought us those types of programs.

On the other hand, that approach has also created a dichotomous situation of one set of programs for older persons, and then programs for everyone else; a few for children, a few for families. The concept of the aging society that I would like to put forth to you moves us away from that artificial distinction of programs for older persons, programs for family, for children. The aging society really refers to the impact of these demographic changes that Leo Estrada had referred to: growing life expectancy, growing numbers of older persons, declining numbers of younger people. In the end, when we are poor we are aging. It doesn't begin at 60 or 65; it begins at birth. Therefore, we need to look at aging as those issues that affect all of us, young and old. And if we are to develop new family policies or progressive family policies, then we must refer to the aging of the society in order to be assured that any family policies that are created do not continue that distinction of excluding older persons. There is a need to reformulate public policies to account for the families and their elders.

In recent years the media has latched on to another concept, referred to as "generational conflict" which essentially espouses the following premises, that older people are taking a greater share of scarce resources and this is responsible for the growing rates of poverty among younger persons and family. That is not true. It's fallacious; it's a bad agrument. But the fact is that that old concept of generational conflict has been taken by some decision makers in the Congress and in the state legislatures as their excuse for trying to reduce the scope of programs for older persons, usually under the guise of we need these resources to help other populations. This concept of generational conflict is divisive and we must be very careful. And to that extent, we must we must move toward multi-generational approaches. We need to once again look at the intergenerational link between

families and their elders.

In the real world, which is where you all sit, people do care about their parents; and parents and older persons do care about their children and their grandchildren. The family in many respects is strong, although it is changing dramatically, and we must now begin to look at ways to provide families with options for taking care of their elders; and we must now find ways for elders to contribute their approach, their needed contribution, their assets, their education to help their families. California is a barometer of the changes and the tensions that could develop and the need to move into intergenerational policy. I won't go over the details of the demographics. We do know that people are living longer; the elderly will grow to 22 percent of the U.S. population by the year 2030 and close to that here in California about the same time. We have a declining labor force, but even more important we now have fewer caretakers. Women are more likely to work in the work force and less likely to be able to stay at home to take care of their mother, mother-in-law, father and father-in-law, because it's mostly women that take care of frail, older persons. And we can clearly not go back to the good old days when the woman could stay at home, take care of her kids and increasingly also take care of frail, older persons. So what this all means is that families in the eighties, nineties and after the year 2000 will need assistance, whether it's formal or informal, to have the choices and the options to involve and take care of their elders. At the same time, elders and older persons will need the options so that they can continue working and continue providing for families.

Alongside the aging of this society and the implications I had mentioned, is a growing multi-culturalism. We're becoming fairly familiar with that, the growing numbers of minority persons, and as Leo Estrada mentioned, the fact that most of the young populations tend to be minorities. So we're going to have a unique situation: young minorities and an aging society. How we integrate the needs of younger minorities and the needs of older persons will be the central question facing policy makers in this state and this country after the year 2000. Those demographic trends -- aging, changing family lifestyles, and multi-culturalism -- will require a fundamental reassessment of both policy, directions, and political leadership as well as changes in your attitudes and mine towards minorities, young people, family, and the elderly. Thus, we must reorient the age-related programs that now exist to begin to account and involve the needs of family. That will not be an easy task. We now have in play a vast array of service, delivery system, and public benefits. That restructuring will create some controversy. But there is hope. For example, in Washington, D.C., there is a coalition entitled "Generation United" which involves older, elderly organizations, such as the American Association of Retired Person, and it also involves organizations representing younger persons such as Children's Defense Fund. The purpose of Generations United is to try to see how we can remodify policies to benefit both older and younger persons. Perhaps no issue best illustrates the need to do this and how we can develop multi-cultural and multi-generational policy than long-term care. Long-term care refers to that broad continuum of services for our nursing homes, to adult day care, to in-home supportive services that provides frail, older persons, young, or disabled with the long-term care they need to remain in the community or the home.

Long-term care is usually thought of as an old people's issue, an elderly issue. It's really a family issue because it is the family and the children and grandchildren of older persons that usually have to bear the burden and the brunt, in particular, women, who were then the traditional caretakers and are now the women caught in the middle. Increasing numbers of women are working, their parents and grandparents living longer and at some time they are trying to take care of their own children and pay for the high cost of education and housing. All this has put an increasing strain on the ability of women in particular as well as men to take care of all generations. What we need is a comprehensive system of long-term care which provides those families, those caretakers with the broad array of choices, of services, social and health services, to best determine how to care for their children and the elderly. Unfortunately most federal programs, particularly Medicare and Medicaid, are oriented towards acute and institutional care. If your older person is sick and needs help, either he stays at home and you pay the bills, or he or she winds up in a nursing home or in a hospital, which are the most expensive and the least personal sets of care for family. California had been a pioneer, by the way, in demonstrating how a continuum of long-term care can help older persons and their families from the linkage program to the Multi-Purpose Senior Services Program. However, these programs tend to be limited in scope and they tend to be demonstration projects.

Just to give us a ray of hope that the public is beginning to understand long-term care and family policies that involve the elderly, a recent national poll showed that 82 percent of Republicans and 92 percent of Democrats favored government action of long-term care, making it really a bipartisan issue. By a rate of 5 to 2, respondents indicated a willingness to tax themselves from $30 to $60 if the federal government would develop a long-term care program. In the next month or so, we will have a very important bill passed, the Catastrophic Health Insurance bill that will protect Medicare beneficiaries against the catastrophic cost of illness. That does not include long-term care, but following that will be debate over the Kemper-Roybill Home Care, Long-Term Care Medicare Protection Act, that will do many of the things that I have been addressing. Needless to say, that bill is controversial because it will cost money but we believe that the public is beginning to be receptive. In the presidential campaign, every candidate is now supporting some type of long-term care. An aging society, in short, will need these types of family policies with provision for some long-term care. But we will also need to develop more expanded family policies such as family allowances for people caring for their older persons, tax credits and tax deductions for families that provide financial support. It also involves the private sector. Corporations, for example, are now finding that their workers are spending more time off the job to take care of an older person than they are spending time to take care of a younger child.

Having laid out the need to provide family policies that take care of older persons, let me now shift and look at the elderly as a major resource. In order not to leave it on the wrong note, it's important to know that any one time only 5 percent of the elderly are in nursing homes. Only about 8 percent of the elderly population need long-term care. The rest are educated, healthy, and active. Therefore, in a time of a declining work force, older persons represent a tremendous, untapped resource. For example, they can serve as teachers in the public schools, particularly with their life-

long experiences. They can serve as the administrators and as providers for these long-term care services. Their sense of involvement can be tagged for volunteer work. The idea of a volunteer care bank for in-home supportive services where older persons who volunteer will get that service if and when they need it is a sound one. Older persons also need additional income; therefore, they are ready to work part time. They are ready to be involved in training and retraining programs if it allows them to go work part time and supplement their income. Now we have an opportunity for state colleges and community colleges to provide a major leadership role in reinvestment and training and tremendous labor potential of an older population.

In looking to the year 2000, with growing numbers of minority children making up the labor force, we will have to prevent any potential tension based upon age or race. The best way to reformulate those policies and avoid that tension is to work on multi-generational policies. For example, I can envision here in Los Angeles where we have a shortage of teachers bringing back retired, older persons to make up for the shortage of public school teachers in the classroom. We will also need to educate young persons, starting at the grade schools and the junior highs, to prepare for their aging and the increase on life expectancies that all of us will face.

In closing, I would also like to point out a personal sense of optimism and excitement about the future of California as it attempts to address changing demographics and changing families. There has been much talk recently about the decline of America and the problems that this country and this state face in competing with other nations such as Japan and West Germany. There has also been recurring talk that the growing numbers of minorities and older persons are a problem as opposed to being a set of opportunities.

A recent article by Joe Cochran and Ileko Kishimoto pointed out some very important points that will hopefully move us from these pessimistic thoughts into more optimistic action. It pointed out that while Japan and West Germany and other nations have an apparent economic advantage over this country, this advantage is temporary. They, for example, have several disadvantages that we do not face. They do not have sufficient land; they do not have natural resources. They lack the entrepreneurship and the innovation that is characteristic of the American work force. But more importantly what those countries lack is immigration. Those countries are noted for closing their borders and restricting any immigrants from entering those countries. And it is the immigrants -- black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islanders, particularly young minority groups -- that provide the entrepreneurship, that provide the work ethic, and continue to increase in this state's and this country's prosperity. More importantly for our country will be immigration and the continuous influx of these young and industrious immigrants. But I would also like to add one more advantage that California and this nation represent. Alongside increasing amounts of immigration and young minorities, we also have a growing elderly population. The baby boomers, when they reach 60 around the year 2010, will represent perhaps the best educated, most active, most healthy older population any society has ever known. Unlike Japan and West Germany, which they are losing population, we have a tremendous, untapped resource in those older persons. We can take advantage of that situation to ensure that this country does not decline and enjoys a renewal and a renaissance, but only

if we develop those types of family policy that involve older person, that allow women and their families choices in caring for their elders, and that allow older persons to play a role in both the productivity and responding to the needs of young minorities as well as families.

So with that I would like to thank you for allowing me to share these ideas with you.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: Let me just begin by addressing the issue of intergenerational public policy. Do you think that, when you and I become mature Californians, we will be able to achieve some of those goals, the long-term care, and the other things that we'll need with the present population at that time? Will the working people be able to sustain their pensions, and so on?

DR. TORRES-GIL: Let me answer it this way: There is no doubt that the aging of the baby boomers, which is the code word Gloria Molina and I represent, will not only produce the largest number of older persons but will produce a most politically powerful interest group in this country. All members of the Congress and the Legislature -- and I'm sure Assemblyman Bates will amen this one -- recognize that older persons are a tremendously influential, political group and we see that in a hundred different ways. If you think they're powerful, the baby boomers will be even more powerful. I have no doubt that as we age we will make sure that social security continues and that there is long-term care because it's in our own best interest. Baby boomers are known for protecting their interests, and we certainly showed that in the '60s and other years.

My concern, though, is this: I've taken the given that this generation will have a better shot at enjoying their older years. My concern, if I can just speak personally, is that if we're ever going to have tensions and conflicts between generation, it may be evident with our generation. Because we will be so politically powerful, unless we're broad minded and avoid selfishness, we may ignore the needs of a smaller work force that's going to be primarily minorities and we may take too many of the public resources. For example, we may have to face very touchy issues like raising the eligibility, or perhaps restricting eligibility under certain circumstances. So my concern is not that the baby boomers will not get the services they need; they will. But will we be farsighted enough to also watch out for the needs of the generation that will be following us?

THE AUDIENCE: I wanted to ask a quick question. If 70 percent of the Los Angeles School District is minority, why are they called minority?

DR. TORRES-GIL: Good question.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: Maybe we should stop today and not start calling them minority any further.

THE AUDIENCE: I just wanted to tell him that it wasn't the enlightened legislators that gave us social security. It was people marching in the streets that did it.

DR. TORRES-GIL: I would amen that. That was very true.

THE AUDIENCE: It is the people who write letters and vote that keep social security and our benefits.

DR. TORRES-GIL: That's one example by older persons.

THE AUDIENCE: The younger people can model the behavior of the people who got social security. My husband was one who marched to Washington to get it.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: Next we have someone who is an expert in her area. She was helpful to me when I was working on my educational and legislative bills up in Sacramento. She's going to be addressing the issue, "Excellence For Whom?" I'd like to introduce Kati Haycock who is Co-Director of The California Achievement Council.

MS. KATI HAYCOCK: Thank you, Gloria, and members of the Task Force. One of the most persistent myths in American education today is the one that suggests that we educate all children the same way. But some kids, especially black kids, Latino kids, and poor kids simply manage to learn less. Low test scores and college-going rates are thus seen as an indication of problems in children or their families rather than as an indication that something is very wrong in our schools.

If we are to understand and make good judgments about what to do for children and families in California, we simply must understand how very wrong this view is. We don't educate all children the same way. We isolate poor and minority children from other students, and into their schools and their educations we put less of everything that we believe makes a difference, less in the way of experienced and well-trained teachers, less in the way of instructional time, less in the way of a rich and well-balanced curriculum, less in the way of well-equipped facilities, and less of what is undoubtedly the most important of all, a belief that children can really learn.

For those poor and minority children who we don't get in this way, we have another practice too and it's called ability grouping, and tracking. It's practiced in virtually all of California's schools. Though the practice is well known, its effects are not, so I'm going to tell you something about it. How does it work? Ordinarily when a youngster walks into the kindergarten or first grade, in about a day or two, a teacher makes a decision about whether that student is a fast learner or a slow learner. Based on that quick decision, the student is assigned to the fast group or to the slow group. Now there's a euphemism for these groups, we call them bluebirds or redbirds, robins and buzzards. So although we call them different things, the students know exactly what's meant by those decisions. Based on that single placement, they too decide who's smart and who's dumb. Further we accentuate that smartness or dumbness by educating students in the top group very differently from the way we educate students in the bottom group. Those in the top group are exposed to things we value as a society. They read books; they discuss ideas; they write about their feelings. What about students in the bottom group? What happens to them? They're educated primarily by ditto. They spend their days circling Ms and Ps on dittos while their peers read books and discuss ideas. It's hardly surprising then what would amount to very small if any differences in the first-grade level have grown quite signficant by the sixth grade. Through both of these practices then, we see differences between schools that serve minority youngsters and schools that serve other youngsters, and differences within schools and how you educate students whom we consider bright or dumb. We invest a good deal less in the education of some children than we do in others.

As if all of this weren't enough, the community surrounding some schools have less to invest in education and school-related things as well. Although study after study has shown that black, Latino, Asian, and poor parents have the same high aspirations for their children as anybody else, they often have less knowledge about how schools work, less flexible time to visit schools, and less of the skill

base necessary to help their children with homework. In addition, as all of you well know, they are too overwhelmed by the circumstances they face, simply making a living from day to day to have the time and the hope to invest in their children. The cumulative effects of these differences in their school and community are simply devastating for California children. No matter what test you look at, tests show very small differences between minority and Anglo children, poor and rich chidren, in the first and second grade; generally speaking no more than about 10 or 15 percentage points on any test. At the level of sixth grade, the gap has grown considerably larger, typically around 30 percentage points or what amounts to about a year or two behind their peers in school. By the time these youngsters reach 12th grade, if they reach 12th grade at all, the gap has grown quite enormous. In many school districts today, the average black or Latino youngsters score about 60 percentile points below the average white youngster on a scale of 100.

Many, of course, don't even manage to graduate from high school. The most recent California data suggest that about one-half of Latino and black youngsters who entered or began in 12th grade did not graduate from high school two-and-a-half years later. What about those who do manage to graduate from school? What kind of opportunities do they have? Recent data from the California Post-Secondary Education Commission show the results. The average Latino and black high school graduate in California becomes eligible to enter a four-year college or university at about one-third the rate of the average Anglo youngster. Those who do enter often wash out of college before graduation because of inadequate preparation.

In short, what comes out of our educational system looks very different than what we saw in the beginning. Those who are prepared by virtue of their education and training to enter white-collar professions are disproportionately Anglo and from affluent families. On the other hand, those who are prepared at best to enter blue-collar jobs are disproportionately poor and ethnic. Not a very good record considering we've been at this for about 25 years. The question we ask, though, is, is all of this inevitable? It's important that we ask that question here today. All of us have heard success stories, stories about schools that beat the odds, schools that take kids that nobody else thinks can learn and somehow manage to produce striking achievement gains. We've heard first, of course, about Marva Collins in her West Side Preparatory School in Chicago. We've heard since then about stories across the country and increasingly about schools here in California, schools that have the same youngsters as anybody else but somehow manage to make a very big difference. By working together, teachers and administrators manage to deliver high-quality education instead of boring, low-quality education and they get results. Test scores in new schools are going up; more students are prepared for college. Things can be different. Together these schools have been doing what most of us knew all along, and, that is, the poor and ethnic youngsters can achieve at the same high levels as anybody else and schools absolutely <u>do</u> make a difference in whether or not that happens. We'll hear about two of those schools when I'm done. But I do want to remind you of a very sad fact, and, that is, that too few schools are making a difference for youngsters right now; schools that achieve are the exception for Latino and black children in California today. We simply must make such schools the rule.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: I want to thank Kati for that information. I'd like to ask her a question, because there are some schools and some classrooms that do make a difference for children. It seems to me that we need to do more with regard to the teacher, that somehow if there is a teacher that knows how to inspire and motivate children, it makes a different group for those children. Do you think we need to do more in the whole area of teacher training and teacher preparation?

MS. HAYCOCK: Absolutely. There is no question in my mind that teachers are the key. There are several kind of problems; first of all, poor quality. Under-educated teachers have been dumped in urban schools for a long time. They've been pushed out of suburban schools and into new schools and there is no question that their own poor education makes them unable to deliver quality education for our students, problem number one. The other problem is that even new teachers who are prepared by the California Schools of Education today simply do not get exposed to the range of teaching strategies they need to be successful with the range of kids. Nobody learns new teaching strategies; nobody gets help when they land in a new classroom and most teachers simply are overwhelmed. We get calls constantly from teachers saying, "Help. I have no idea what to do. I'm in a classroom where I thought I would be teaching kids with ninth-grade English skills and, in fact, most of them have about third-grade level skills and nobody ever taught me what to do about that." The fact is that good teachers, and some of them are here today, know how to deal with that. We have to teach others how to do that.

THE AUDIENCE: Some teachers are prejudiced and grade minority children unfairly. Can't tests be used instead?

MS. HAYCOCK: The problem is that tests that are supposed to check on whether the grading is objective or not aren't very objective themselves, so we don't really have any good devices.

Let me just make two comments about what you said. First, there is no question, though, that there is some racial stereotyping amongst California teachers today. Anybody who would argue that is lying. However, my own observation is that there's a lot less of it than I expected. I had some preconceived notions that said, you know, a lot of teachers are racists and just thought these kids didn't need quality education. I don't see a lot of that. What I see instead is a different kind of racism. I see teachers who have lowered expectations in the belief that they're helping kids. Because kids are having difficulty at home or in the community (or they didn't eat the night before) some teachers believe that they ought to excuse them from the homework that they didn't do or excuse them for doing poorly on a test. The fact is that those lowered expectations hurt far more than they help but that they're done with good intentions gives me some hope. I am hopeful too that we can get to those teachers and provide them with the appropriate teaching strategies while reminding them that lowering expectations regardless of whether you do it because you're a racist or because you love these children harms them.

CO-CHAIRMAN BATES: Well, what do you suggest that we do about all of this?

MS. HAYCOCK: Well, the Sacramento State Superintendent has a fairly simple solution that they're about to introduce in the Legislature, and that solution is simply to tell all these schools that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

they're horrible; and if they don't improve the State will put them into academic bankruptcy and take them over. Personally I'm a little skeptical that that will make a major difference. What I see is a desperate need for assistance. I just left a group of 30 principals from all over California, from Sacramento down to San Diego, and they came together to talk about what works and what doesn't, to hear from other principals and teachers who have made a difference. We need to help these folks learn what it takes to improve schools. We need to give them some assistance from the very best California principals as they work through their problems. We need to help them intensively retrain their teachers in the summer so that we don't have teachers, as we do in some schools, who tell their kids that the sun goes around the earth! We know how to retrain teachers; we know how to help schools through an orderly process of change. It doesn't require magic. But to simply tell them to get better and if they don't to tell them they're horrible doesn't work.

THE AUDIENCE: What do you do with schools where you put your child in a bilingual classroom because the teacher's supposed to know both languages, as I did with my son so that he could be oriented in both languages, not just one. Yet the teacher is under a waiver and doesn't know <u>one</u> word of Spanish except that her last name is Catillo. Are the Superintendent, the Board and others going to stand for that position?

MS. HAYCOCK: Well, that's probably not illegal but I'm afraid all across California there are loads of teachers on waivers.

THE AUDIENCE: Why is a waiver used?

MS. HAYCOCK: Well, I'm perhaps not the best person to answer that. But the fact is that the situation is getting worse, not better. The number of young people enrolled in bilingual credential programs has actually dropped dramatically over the last couple of years. So I suspect that there's an end in sight, unfortunately. I think the best you can do in this kind of circumstance is that if the teacher does not know the language and has not mastered techniques that do work, then take the child out of that school.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: Next we have some of those special teachers who are really taking the time to work directly with their students and they have made a difference. They're here to address "Education, The Bridge to Today's Labor Market". First of all, I'd like to call on Ms. Natalie Copeland, who's a teacher at Audubon Junior High and has brought with her two students -- Melissa Crowder who is the President of the ninth-grade class and Alisa Morgan who is a president of Students Against Drunk Driving, which has a chapter on the Audubon Campus.

MS. NATALIE COPELAND: Audubon Junion High School is located in the Crenshaw District of Los Angeles with a student body population of 1,950, 93 percent black. Coining Gene McCallum's philosophy, who is the principal of Audubon, who could not be here today: I strongly believe that all students can learn. We must properly educate our black students through a strong instructional program with teachers who truly believe that black students can learn. Administrators, faculty, and other support personnel work together at Audubon as a team trying to achieve the educational goals we have set, mainly that every student shall have the right to equality education in a safe, supportive environment.

The school climate is set through various methods. To name a few, a pre-open school assembly is held for all parents and students new to Audubon. Students are issued contracts at the beginning of school and followed monthly by grade-level assemblies enforcing the rules in the contract. School teachers are given scheduled faculty and department meetings also enforce the rules of the contract. The goals and rules are presented to the parents through the monthly communication known as the "Audubon Eagle". Since these goals were identified and approved by the faculty, administrative staff, parents, and students working together, each has a stake in the achievement of each goal we have set. There are also informal methods of communication. These include conferences with parents and students and teachers when needed. Teachers are constantly reminded of the primary goal of students to achieve. Students are continually reminded that there are no "free lunches"; they must produce if they expect to receive a reward. Through phone calls, written notices, and scheduled progress cards, parents are reminded that their assistance and involvement are essential to the child's achievement. Both students and parents, plus teachers, have an opportunity to exercise their voice at the school's monthly Community Advisory Council Meeting. We have separate programs at Audubon to teach democracy as a way of life. A very successful program across the district fosters multi-ethnic student exchange between three junior high schools from diverse ethnic neighborhoods in this school district.

Audubon is one of the only two schools chosen in the United States to work with the National Geographic Society. The Inter-Cultural Awareness Program works to foster an understanding of the cultural myths present in our society. We bring in a variety of ethnic groups to perform for the students and share differences and contributions. Project Citizen is one of the projects encouraging students to take active part in the electorial process. Project Dialogue brings students with senior citizens to exchange ideas and to bridge the generation gap. Class standards are posted in each classroom and reminded to students daily. We have been fortunate to be a part of the Adopt a School Program. We have been adopted by Boys (?), Burger King, McDonald's, and also Jack-in-the-Box. These various businesses sponsor award assemblies for the students who are achievers, not only on the "A" level but also the "C" level, and encourage the others to do likewise. Our students have been very successful participants in various organizations. They have won such contests, as the Los Angeles City Council English Contest, Rapid Transit District Essay Contest, Science Fair, Computer Club, Chess Club, and many others within the school. We are very excited about our new program, Homework Hotline. Students telephone after school and receive homework assistance from their peers and the peers are given a small stipend each week for helping other students succeed.

There is a united effort by staff, parents, and the community at large to provide a well-disciplined and orderly campus. The basis of good student conduct is a strong instructional program and good classroom management techniques. Our teachers are always in staff development, receiving techniques on classroom management, and learning how to cope with the various students they come in contact with. Building leadership is also part of our goals. Students receive recognition through the honor society, which includes the Falcons, the Bear Program, I Have a Dream Foundation, Young Black Scholars, and Golden Opportunity Program. Many departments within the school also award

students.

Our students are also trained to share. They have generously contributed to the United Way and the Brotherhood Crusade. We encourage the students to do outside reading in our yearly magazine drive. Students learn about college and opportunities at an early age through our UCLA Partnership Program and the Med Corp Program at USC. The Junior High Assistance Program is available to all students experiencing difficulty in poor attendance, poor behavior, and a lack of academic achievement. In an effort to develop honesty and respect for the property of others, students are encouraged to return items found through the "club finders".

Audubon teachers have received many awards for their effort and dedication in working with students. In 1985 we had California Teacher of the Year; in 1986 we had the Los Angeles Reading Outstanding Teacher and Outstanding Teacher in Social Studies Award. We were also declared California Distinguished School in 1986; and in 1987 the school received Excellence in Education from the State Education Department. Last year, 1988, our principal received the California Educator of the Year Award; and last week our drama teacher got the Bravo Award from the LA Music Center.

We regularly and frequently monitor students' progress by having Parent-Teaching Conferencing Night, sending complimentary notices home, having regular tardy slips, a 15-minute rule -- no students shall be out of class the first 15 minutes. Teachers are constantly standing at the doors in passing periods, encouraging students to have a nice day, and get to the next class on time. We are constantly aware of the importance of being positive role models for our students: administrative staff, faculty, cafeteria personnel, custodians, secretaries, campus aides. Every person on our campus who comes in contact with students is reminded that we are all being watched by their youthful eyes. We have a responsibility to demonstrate the qualities of ethical behavior, awareness, and dignity which we expect to nurture in these young students. We feel that we provide our inner-city students with an outstanding education; we make them aware of available opportunities and we prepare them to be contributing members in our democratic society. We are proud of our students at Audubon.

CO-CHAIRWOMAN WATSON: Gloria, I must take this opportunity because Audubon is in my district and I'm so proud what they're doing there. I am bringing the finalist, the person who won the Bravo Award, to Sacramento, soon and the other seven finalists in the Bravo Award. I just wanted you to know that we do have excellence in the 28th Senatorial District.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: It's wonderful to take pride in our schools. I'm sure we have them all over but it's particularly great that they're here with us to share their accomplishments.

Let's bring out two of the students, Melissa Crowder, who I said is the President of the ninth-grade class. Would you please come up? She's going to be joined by an Alisa Morgan who is the President of Black Students and Alcoholism and Drug Abuse. Would you please both come up.

MS. MELISSA CROWDER: I'm honored to be here this afternoon to speak on behalf of my leadership class. In leadership we participate and sponsor many activities. We sponsor dances and assemblies for the students at Audubon Junior High School. We help the teachers and administrators as well. Being in leadership is a privilege because in a way it's preparing us for college and for the

near future. I enjoy leadership because we are allowed to get closer to the administrators as well.

Our wonderful principal is Mr. Gene McCallum. He's always visible on campus which I feel is a good opportunity to learn more about him as well as our school. Mrs. Brenda Bride who is in charge of leadership makes sure that leadership lives up to its name because we are the leaders of the school and we have to represent our school in a manner of excellence.

In leadership we begin our day by having a meeting in which we are all allowed to share ideas and plans for our fellow students. I am honored to be in leadership because I'm able to work with my peers and I feel it will help me in the near future to help other people as well.

MS. ALISA MORGAN: My name is Alisa Morgan and I'm the President of the SAAD Chapter at Audubon Junior High School. SAAD, which stands for Students Against Alcohol and Drugs, is a program organized to keep all the students away from drugs, alcohol, and gangs. SAAD has four main goals: One, to teach students alternatives to alcohol and away from gangs; two, to alert students to the dangers of alchohol, drugs, and gangs; three, to promote the school Drug and Alcohol Awareness Programs; and four, to organize the Fear of Toxins Program for teen-agers who need help.

First of all, we're trying to get every student on campus to join and sign a contract. The contract states that the student will say no to alcohol, drugs, and gangs and they will help their friends and family members say no too. Also on campus at Audubon, we have what we call Project Outreach. The purpose of Project Outreach is to help kids recuperate from the general problems they have had in the past. And we are determined to put an end to this problem. With the help of SAAD, Project Outreach, parents, teachers, and other students, we can make a difference in the world we're living in today and have a better, brighter future for the students and teachers and children of the future.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: Are there any questions for the two students?

THE AUDIENCE: I don't have a question but I wanted you to note that we have two young ladies for the leaders, not young men.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: Absolutely.

THE AUDIENCE: How much classical music and good heart is there in the schools today?

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: Probably zip, but let me find out. Very frankly Proposition 13 took away all of our after-school programs and all of our music programs. I'm sure that there are teachers there that carry out their own programs.

Ms. Copeland, would you know?

MS. COPELAND: We are very active in art and music; the Bravo Award, is because of the drama class and the school.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: And classical music?

MS. COPELAND: We have two instrumental classes. We have the band and also one section of classical music.

THE AUDIENCE: Is that only in Audubon or in all of the schools?

MS. COPELAND: I cannot answer for the other schools.

THE AUDIENCE: You see, previously, I was a musician for the philharmonic, and I used to go

to black and Latino schools and I found them very eager for classical music. When I asked in the assembly, "Does anybody play an instrument?" only one child held up his hand in the whole assembly, and said, "My brother plays the guitar."

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: We aren't providing as many of those supportive services, unfortunately. Probably the only way we can meet that gap is by calling on people like yourself as volunteers to go out to the schools and try to present something that is very critical and important and that is surely the arts.

Next I'd like to introduce someone special who will introduce our next speaker. She's someone special to me, someone I've known a long time. She is a special consultant to Senator Roberti on his Task Force on the Family. She's Miss Margarita Contreras who's going to introduce our next speaker.

MS. MARGARITA CONTRERAS: It's really special for me to stand next to you, Gloria, at the podium, not only because my family still resides in your district but I grew up in Northeast Los Angeles. The next person that I want to introduce is a person who's the principal of the elementary school that I attended as a child. Dr. Yvonne Aguirre Davis will share with you the successes of the model Griffin Elementary School. I know Dr. Yvonne Aguirre Davis to be a very committed person; she is a recipient of the L.A. Chamber of Commerce award for Outstanding Principal of the Year, 1986; currently a member of a State Task Force on Underachieving Schools; and is known as a leader in the community. One other thing I just want to share with you is that this young woman goes beyond the call of duty and has other interests beyond just the elementary school. She has a vision of what her elementary school will be like seven years down the road because she visits the County General Hospital and works with mothers who have just had babies who will more than likely have their children attend her elementary school. And I would also like to add that I was born in County General Hospital, here in L.A.

DR. YVONNE AGUIRRE DAVIS: Thank you. I hope to have as much poise as the two students did. They were absolutely marvelous. It's an honor to address people who appreciate the power and significance of the family because we at the school level really do see it and hopefully some day the politicians will too.

I am principal at Griffin. And just to give you a brief background it's in Lincoln Heights. We have approximately 850 students; 70 percent Hispanic, 30 percent Asian, and over 55 percent of our students are either limited-English speaking or non-English speaking. Like other educators, I want to make the difference; I want our students to achieve. The challenge in my judgment is to achieve that in the context of equity, and that means that all students, regardless of their gender, their ethnicity, or their socioeconomic status will have the opportunity to maximize their potential to receive a quality education.

If you heard Kati Haycock and others who have spoken about the enormous dropout rate that we have, the fact that hundreds of thousands of students who enter our schools do so at a quarter percent, a fourth of them are at the poverty level; 15 percent are mentally or physically handicapped; 15 percent are non-English speaking immigrants; 14 percent from teenage mothers and so on. That's the context in which we face our challenge. Now if we in education are building a bridge to the labor

market, which ultimately will determine the quality of our society, and that is an awesome task, we are asked to do many things, teach about AIDS, nuclear issues, child abuse, just everything you can think of. But I have focused in on what I think will be our contribution to the labor market, that is, first, quality/equality of education. In our school that means our students are taught the skills at grade level. We do not keep them in remediation because we feel that to do so is to keep them crawling for six years, to put them out in the labor market made up of sprinters and long-distance runners and we don't want to do that. So we focus on grade-level skills and in their aplication in science, social studies, heavy literature, and writing activities.

Our teachers are great, though they go beyond that into a kind of a values orientation. We want to develop a sense of responsibility in our students, a sense of a work ethic, dependability, and cooperation. Many of our teachers do their teaching with cooperative groups which means more work for the teacher. It looks like it's less but it's actually more work but the payoff is great.

Secondly, we want to eliminate as much as possible the dropouts. Each student comes to us as a potential burden to society if they drop out or a potential benefit.

At our school, we identify at-risk students and then we have organized programs, not haphazardly but really focused programs on how we'd like to prevent these students from dropping out in junior and senior high schools. So if they've been retained or have learning problems that we give them added assistance. We no longer take them out for remediation. They just get more help in application in their classroom with on-grade level skills. As I said before, if they're absent a lot, we call right away. If they have attitude problems or behavior problems, we have counseling. We really are working on having the students feel a sense of belonging, making a contribution, and building up their sense of responsibility.

I just want to highlight a couple of the activities that we do at our school because there are certain things we recognize, reinforce, and reward; we want to redirect our students' energies and interests on those lines and that's what we've done. We have a strong alliance, just as Audubon does, with the business community and we recognize outstanding achievement with a free hamburger, fries, and a coke from Jack-in-the-Box. We have bumper stickers that says, "My Child is Outstanding Student of the Month at Griffin" and they're very colorful. We also have a strong focus on the future. I go into the classrooms and I teach a lesson on the lifeline. Who said our kids can't add and subtract? They figured out my age in two seconds. I start with my birth and go all the way to my death and I have my life in between described in how I went back to college, got a doctorate, and all that.

The students made their own lifeline. Jose is here, and I'm going to just share his. He was born in Mexico, and he wants to be a judge. Our students are making decisions now on the kind of future they want. This is a little Vietnamese girl named Sam who says, "Get married with a hard-working partner." She's thinking ahead. I thought that was marvelous. A young man, Cantonese speaking, wrote, "In my 20s I will find a beautiful lady and I will ask her to marry me and she won't say yes." He wants to be a scientist and do something that no other scientist has done. What I'm saying is that we're getting them in elementary school to think ahead.

Basically then our dropout program aims at early identification and organizing a program. We

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

have a buddy system where each adult volunteers to connect with what we call "at-risk students" and we all have orange juice at recess. I have two buddies. We will have a reception for them with a lot of interaction and that's a very important part of our program. I'm skipping back. Are we successful? I will show you our scores, although I would do a disservice to the teachers if I say we only look at scores. Our students are polite; their attendance is extremely high; they care about each other. Our teachers work with each other. They are very dedicated and hard working. As I was sitting up there on the platform, each person I saw walk in was one of my teachers. And I'd just love for them to stand; they're giving up their Saturday. If my teachers from Griffin can just stand and the parents who came. They overwhelm me all the time.

I'd like to share our test results, knowing, please, that that's only one way of measuring. Please remember that we have a strong population of limited- and non-English speaking students. At almost every grade level, they score quite high, and we are very proud of those scores. Students certainly can learn; it just takes a united effort. We had a contest at our school in telling "What My Family Means to Me" and we have one student from each sixth-grade classroom who will come up and read their essays for you.

MS. QUYNH TANG: "What My Family Means to Me". My family means a lot to me. I come from an Asian family. We do many favors for each other and I think that the main one in our family is dependence. I know I can always count on my family to do something for me or to just be there when I need them.

In my family, we have different jobs. I am lucky because I'm the youngest and most of the work is done by my three older sisters. I usually go to them for advice. For example, when I have to decide whether to go someplace or not or if I should buy something, they help me to decide. They come to me for advice too. And that's what makes me feel good, knowing that they care for my opinion.

My parents are a great part of my life. They help me when things are rough and are there when I need them. Even when they have problems of their own, they put their problems aside and help me with mine.

I am confident that my family can provide me with the things that I need. I feel that my family is very generous too. When someone needs something, the others are always willing to lend a helping hand. I feel that in order for a family to get along, to work is essential and that is definitely what my family has. To work is not something that can easily be taken away even though sometimes we disagree and argue. The family is not injured by any differences in opinions.

When I think of the future, I'm certain that my family will help me. I didn't notice this before but they are helping me now. My parents are keeping me in school and making sure I get good grades. My sisters are teaching me things I need to know so I can prepare for the next grade. I also think of helping myself by trying my best at everything I do. My parents say that no matter what I'm to be, they'll be behind me all the way. My parents really care for our education and they want us to have a great future with a good job. My sisters have a very good influence on me. They always try their best at everthing they do and they don't give up easily. I am like them.

I still haven't decided what I want to be; but if I do get a good job, I'm going to give my parents what they want or need. I feel they deserve it after all they've done for me. I am proud to belong to the Tang family.

DR. DAVIS: Teresa Robles, would you read yours, please? She is going to read hers in Spanish.

MS. TERESA ROBLES: _____(In Spanish...)_____.

DR. DAVIS: Jose Lopez.

MR. JOSE LOPEZ: "What My Family Means to Me". I live with my mother and father. I have a six-year-old brother and a one-year-old sister. My dad works at two jobs. My mom doesn't work. She takes care of my little sister. I don't get to see my dad very much, only on Saturdays and Sundays, because he's always working.

On Saturdays we go to a park and sometimes we go to the stores to buy things when my dad gets his check. My parents love me and care for me because when I have problems they help me.

Our family is very united. We trust each other and we help each other. My mother and father help teach me to have responsibility and they always tell me to be very honest. My parents trust each other. We also work with each other. My parents trust that I will stay away from drugs. They teach me the right values. My parents tell me not to drop out of school so I can get a good job. They will help me plan when I get married and have a family. My family is encouraging me to study hard so I can get a scholarship, graduate from college, and have a good future.

DR. DAVIS: Our last student is Menh Vong.

THE AUDIENCE: What are their grades?

DR. DAVIS: All sixth graders. We have four sixth-grade classes in our school and so we picked one from each of those. They've been here a long time.

MR. MENH VONG: "What My Family Means to Me". I was born in Vietnam in a police station. When I was born, there was war in Vietnam. One day while my mom and dad carried me back in an army street, machine-gun fire broke out. In panic my mom and dad left me behind. A man and a woman who later became my adoptive parents picked me up and took me home. My adoptive parents, brothers, sisters, and I moved to Hong Kong; from Hong Kong we moved to China; from China we moved to Pennsylvania; and from Pennsylvania we moved to Los Angeles, California.

I live with my adoptive father, my nephews, and nieces. My adoptive mom died when I was in the fourth grade. I have a hard-working family. We are a team together. We help each other with our work. My father teaches me how to do math. I've learned many things from my family. I have one big happy family. We are really proud of each other. When we have a problem, someone in our family can help solve it. We like to share things. We are taken good care of when we are sick.

My family prepares me for the future. They help me with my education. My parents prepare me for school. They want me to go on to college because they want me to be successful. My family wants me to be smart and have a safe and a prosperous life. I am proud to belong to the Vong family. They love me very much.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: Thank you, Dr. Aguirre Davis, for sharing that with us. I think that brings it all in perspective with the kind of work that we need today to make sure that these

young people will have the kind of opportunities that they rightfully deserve.

Our last panelist, and he's brought a family with him, is someone who's been doing some work in this whole area of immigrant students. He has conducted a study that's called "Immigrant Students in the Schools Project". He's part of California Tomorrow and he's going to be addressing the issue of emerging diversity and changing values. I'd like to introduce to you Mr. Marvin Martinez.

MR. MARVIN MARTINEZ: Today I will discuss our study that was recently published on the social educational experiences of immigrant students. We just finished hearing about some students' experiences and they're very fascinating, as well as inspiring and encouraging.

In the research that we did, we found that one in six of the students in the California public schools are foreign born, that is, 16 percent of the students in our schools are foreign born. What this means is that California's changing classrooms are seen all over the state. As we went up and down the state and from classroom to classroom, we began to see these changes of population. We also saw that these changes are affecting the families. We looked at the many barriers and difficulties parents as well as students are facing in trying to make that adjustment into a new culture and language. Obviously one of the toughest barriers for many of these families is, of course, language. Today we find that many of these students are coming in with different languages: Spanish, Cambodian, Chinese, Mandarin, Tagalog. Many are coming as low-income students, without prior schooling, and coming to this country by themselves.

I interviewed many students who have come into this country by themselves at the age of 10 or 12. They come from countries like El Salvador, Nicaragua, Mexico, Cambodia. Many come into classrooms without that needed parental support. As some of the student speakers said today, parental support is very necessary if you want to make it in school.

These experiences have had a tremendous impact on the children as they attend their schools and try to also adjust to a new culture, language, and land. Many times the child is usually the first one in their family to forge a new path into that new culture. Many times they live a way of life that's very unfamiliar to what the parents have seen. Today you will hear one such student speak about some of his experiences in school and about the number of immigrant students who are coming into his junior high school, and how he's trying to cope with life in America. Despite these obstacles and difficulties, what we have found is that parents want to get involved with their students' education. They often spoke to us eloquently about their confusion and concern over their children's education. We found many parents who were organizing themselves to develop effective means to serve as advocates and supports for their children's education. We found this to be encouraging, inspiring, and a necessary step in trying to improve the quality of their children's education.

The vast majority of school district personnel agree on the need to create better mechanisms for communicating its schools and immigrant parents. I went into many parent advisory meetings, often conducted in the English language. Considering the composition of the groups, I'm surprised that many parents came to the next meeting because they just could not understand what was going on at either meeting. They want to help but it's very hard for them to understand what the school's doing.

Today I brought with me some people who have developed some mechanisms for helping immigrant families and the schools to better communicate with each other. I brought me a teacher, a parent, and a student and you will find their stories very fascinating.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: Let me introduce to you the bilingual education teacher at Le Conte Junior High School in Hollywood. Adelina Alegria has been working directly with a lot of the immigrant students and immigrant families.

MS. ADELINA ALEGRIA: I work for the Human Resource Center in Le Conte Junior High School in Hollywood and I want to make a couple of comments. When Dr. Estrada was talking about the increasing number of immigrants that are coming into the country, I was thinking that Hollywood was the place where everybody comes, because our junior high school has close to 2,200 students. I would say that we have 40 percent Hispanic, 20 percent Armenian, 30 percent Asian from all the different countries, and about 5 percent black. So we have everything. We have about 47 different languages represented in my school. In my classroom alone, I would say that I have about 10 different languages right now; so I do know about the immigrants.

My job as a bilingual resource teacher is to serve their needs. And when Marvin Martinez asked me to talk here today, he asked me to really talk about parental involvement. Now after listening to three students coming up here and talking to you, I don't really have to say anything about parental involvement. All I can tell you is that if there is no parental involvement in the school, especially in Los Angeles public schools, we will not have any education. I believe that parents are extremely important and that they will do everything possible to help the future of the students. Part of my job is to train and work with parents. When I mean training, I am talking about helping them develop the skills that they need to help their children read and write. I do it both in Spanish and English. I have people who help me do it for Armenian, Oriental and Vietnamese parents. So we do all kinds of different language programs in my school.

One of the things I'm trying to do right now is to really get involved with the Hispanic parents. Because our population in the high school alone is close to 60 percent Hispanic, we obviously need to reach out to them. Part of my job as a teacher, as an educator for my students, is to really communicate with their parents. I believe that parents do make a difference. If you were listening to the students before me, all of them talked about values and morals. All of them talked about the importance of an education that the family has given them. Many of my students, even though they might have only one parent or an uncle or an aunt, whatever, those people do have proper values.

When Kathy Haycock talked about making schools that really are achieving schools or trying to produce schools where teachers work with the students and do something with the academics, she was talking about parent involvement. When the people from Ottawa came out here they also talked about care and involvement. We need to work with parents. I think that some parents need to be guided, but I am not talking about reeducation or anything like that. Rather we're talking about involving them in the skills that they need to work with their children for reading and writing. I really believe in our bilingual program and we need to develop reading in Spanish and in English, both. A lot of parents tell me that their children don't read because they don't know any English, but I tell

them that the importance is in Spanish reading. It has nothing to do with English at this point. They need to develop their reading skills. From there they go on to different skills and that comes along with the English, which is what I teach. That's what I'm doing at la Con. Parents need to know the basic skills that their children need. They need to be there for them, even once a week, as long as the children know that they care. It's really important.

We also need to have the parents make time and I think that we do that by setting programs that are going to be good for them and at a convenient time. If they're working in the mornings, then that means we have programs in the evenings for the parents. We try to accommodate education for the parents in the school so there's communication. If communication is lacking, the parents will not be there in the school. It's a lot more than sending letters home. Some of the teachers in the school where I work have visitation; that is, once a month they try to visit a student or a family. That really makes a big difference, just going to the home and then telling the parents that they really do care.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: The parents' component is a very important part of bilingual education as well. A lot of people forget that. I know, because being Spanish speaking when I entered school, and my mother totally Spanish speaking. I came home with notes that were always in English. She never understood what was going on. There was never any relationship. I'm glad that that's changing. It's unfortunate that the English-only forces don't understand how significant that communication is between parent and schools in order to get that kind of involvement.

Next I'd like to introduce one of those parents that gets involved. As usual, they're the ones that do everything. She is a parent organizer, a single mother, a working mother; and she's also attending school on a part-time basis. I'd like to introduce to you Ms. Celia Arroyo.

MS. CELIA ARROYO: I want to tell you a little bit about myself. I was born here in California; and for whatever reason, my parents took me back to Mexico. I did my elementary school studies in Mexico which gave me good self-esteem. When I came here, it was a cultural shock for me because I did not know that I was going to be here by myself with only my mother, after being raised with six brothers and three sisters. Nevertheless I survived the cultural shock. I hated to learn the language; I was against it. It was a horrible experience.

I dropped out of high school because I thought that we were going back to Mexico which we never did. My mother and I came first because we were citizens and then the whole family came. I remember my older sister saying, "You know what, Celia? I'm not going to be working in a factory for the rest of my life." And I thought, God, here I am, not knowing the language, and I also dropped out of high school to work in the factory. Well, she was a good role model for me and she really pushed me and said, you know, "You can do it. Go for it. You can do it."

Now I am a single parent; I went through a divorce; I went through school and I went through different training programs. Since I was eight years old, I always wanted to be a teacher. I taught catechism to my little brothers and sisters and I thought, you know, "I'm going to try to become a teacher." I worked in an educational setting for 11 years and all the teachers kept telling me, "Celia, you can do it. Go for it." And I thought, "Oh, no. I have a baby." They said, "Celia, just go; come on, do it." Well, I got my Bachelor's Degree and I thought, "What am I going to do with a Bachelor's

Degree? I cannot teach. I have to go get my credential." I decided to go back, not just for my credential but for my masters. Now this is my last semester. I have three jobs in order to support my child.

I volunteer in a program called "Program Discovery". We work in our unified school district, Lennox, Paramount, Norwalk, La Mirada, and Concord. Our main message is to the parents because the teachers aren't the key to our children's education. We have to get the parents involved. (Actually, I volunteered for many years and finally this year they've decided to pay me. About time; I needed the money!) But organizing parents can be difficult because most of our volunteer workers are English speakers, so I felt that I had to and could relate to the parents. I tell them, "Hablo Espanol." When I start talking, I have to do a second part in my presentation in Spanish. I help parents understand that language is no barrier any more; we can go and participate in school. I know; I did it. I went to my son's school to find out how he was labeled. He was labeled "limited English". Yet every time I talked to the teachers they would tell me, "Your son is reading above grade level." How could he be reading above grade level if he's labeled "limited English"? The school needed the money so that was a good way to get money too. But I thought that was ridiculous, and got my son out of that program. I love bilingual education. I do believe in bilingual education, but opportunity is not in bilingual education. That's why I dropped out so many times in school and came back and said, "Forget it." I'm going to support bilingual education. I'm going to talk to the parents. We had a nice parents' conference in conjunction with UC Irvine Student Affirmative Action, Cal State Dominguez Student Affirmative Action, El Camino College, and Compton Community College. I'm working also part of the time teaching ESL classes to parents. I have parents attending with children in their arms, because they can't find child care.

When I see these parents, I feel so glad that they've come. They want to become educated and the programs can work with parents getting involved. How do we get parents involved? We have to go to them. We go to the churches and recruit students there. We tell them, "You don't have to be a citizen and you don't need a green card to go to school. All you need to do is to present some proof that you've been in this area for so many years." Sometimes we lie about it but we get the parents to come to school. They want to learn the language. I don't care whether they're there because of the amnesty or because they really want to. One thing I tell them, "You are the role model of your child." I know. I have been a single parent; my son is already ten and he looks at me and says, "Wow, mom, when are you going to take a break? Make this an emergency. I want to be with you." I travel from one job to another; and then go to school. I tell my son, "I have to go talk to these parents today." Sometimes I take my son with me to my classes, presentations, and conferences. He's there helping me a lot too. But the main thing is to take every single message to the parents. They make the difference. I know, teachers do; but parents do too; they're the main key of the future.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: We've had a teacher that deals with immigrant students; we've had a parent that's involved in parent organizing with the new students. Next I'd like to introduce one of those students. His name is Roberto Gil. He is a student at Le Conte Junior High School. He was born in Guatemala. He immigrated to the United States in 1985.

MR. ROBERTO GIL: My name is Roberto Gil, and I'm studying at Le Conte Junior High. I'm in the ninth grade right now. When I came here, I thought I was never going to learn English, and I always used to say to myself, "Roberto, study. Don't be like other people who just don't want to study." What I think is that nobody's dumb in school. If they want to study, they can study, as I did. Now I'm a regular English student. Often, I used to spend my lunch with gang members and asked them how they got into gangs. What they said was that their parents don't care about them. I tried to ask why they thought that. They said that they could be drinking at home, or taking drugs at home, or saying bad words there and their parents don't tell them anything. If their parents do tell them something, it is just to say, "Do this," but they don't help them do it.

My friend Jose used to be in a gang two years ago. He often said that his parents hated him. But I would tell him to talk to his parents because it's not good just to say that they hate you. If you could see him now! His parents are great with him and he's an "A" student. He is graduating this year or next and he already has gotten a scholarship at UCLA.

Then I have another friend who says that he is never going to study anymore because his parents are always hitting him and they won't help him. What I tell him is that his parents maybe just want to make him toe the mark. He always tells me that I've helped him a lot because his parents have changed now, although he's still having a bad time but I'm trying to help him. I think that parents are the best part of the family; in my family, I always talk to my parents every single day. I tell them my problems; they tell me their problems. If I think something's right and they think differently, we always try to work it out. We always try to make a solution that will be right in a common way, that is, it's not optional to anybody but yet will be helpful to me. That's why I think that parents ar the best part in the family because if there were no parents, there would be no family anymore in this world.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: It is wonderful to finally end this panel by talking to and listening to students and many people who are directly involved. It is very clear that we must start looking at California's new population. Families are still ever important but families are changing. I think those kinds of diversities need to be respected and hopefully we'll be formulating policy that is going to be meeting those specific needs.

The students that wrote the essay on "What My Family Means to Me" brought the essays with them and have taped them all along the hallways out here so you'll have an opportunity to read them.

At this time I'd like to introduce again the students from Griffin Elementary School. They have a presentation for Assemblyman Bates and Senator Watson.

MS. TANG: We would like to present this set of essays to Assemblyman Bates and Senator Watson. Thank you for caring about our families.

COUNCILWOMAN MOLINA: Those are the essays of all the sixth-grade students at Griffin Elementary. Hopefully Senator Watson and Assemblyman Bates will share them with all the members of the Legislature to get a new insight about families here in Los Angeles.

We thank you very much for being so attentive to our panel. We think we presented very good speakers who brought some new information and new insight into the ever-changing population in

California and its diversity.

CO-CHAIRMAN BATES: I want to thank you very much for spending a Saturday afternoon with us and I want to thank all the students and their parents for the presentation. It was very moving and inspiring so I was really glad that I had a chance to hear it.

The next panel is called "The Changing Family Economics" and it's being moderated by Ellen Teninty who's with the Center for Ethics and Social Policy and a person I've worked with for about seven years.

MS. ELLEN TENINTY: Good afternoon. I do recognize we are the fourth panel of the day. That means we are all power diggers in the cleanup spot. So be prepared for a very powerful, live testimony here that will keep you until the time to go.

This panel addresses the realities that families today are facing due to economic trends. A great many of the problems that we have outlined and heard very poignant testimony about stem from economic pressures that are unnecessarily created through lack of economic policy. The economic pressures that we are describing, along with the demographic changes, have increased dramatically in the last 15 years. The problems people face today were not imagined 15 or 20 years ago. You've all heard that children today face lowered expectations from that of their parents for the first time in the history of the United States. The panel who are experts through experience will reveal the frustrations that families today face, trying to make it on less income, even in situations where both parents are working full time. What is it to try and build a stable family while the nature of growth area in the job market is characterized by part-time, temporary, casual, self-employed classifications of work. From the supposedly many new jobs listed in the papers, few are enough to support a family; almost none offer health benefits for the family. Very few even offer benefits for the employees themselves. Even fewer provides current coverage for things like pensions. We heard earlier today that the only reason that our senior population is out of poverty is the combination of both social security and a private pension. Less than a quarter of the workers today are able to earn private pensions in their jobs.

The Japanese concept, which was highly touted and taken up in Detroit, was called "conbine" and it meant just-in-time inventory. By the time it was instituted, it was talking about spare parts for the assembly-line process of making a car. That process has now been applied to the work force. So we have a just-in-time work force on call, casual, contingent work force, or as Businessweek calls it, "The Disposable Employee".

At the middle and upper levels of the economy, families are also living with great uncertainty. Well over half of the Fortune 500 corporations have undergone restructuring in the last five years. It's expected that another 60 percent will be "restructuring" in the next three or four years. This is largely due to hostile takeover attempts, which questionably lead to any productive outcome for the economy. Already tens of thousands of Californians have been handed their pink slips in the aftermath of a hostile takeover attempt. I'd like you to note that in half of these recent layoffs people have not received one day of advanced notice, zero notice, before losing their job.

The economy is a system of interdependence. It's the expression of our value systems that the

young students were talking about today. Its Greek word is oikos which means household. The public household is the economy. Regardless of an American cultural mythology about the dignity of making it on one's own by your proverbial bootstraps, it's got to be true that civilization is only a collective, a community and a family endeavor. It's the evaluation and reflection of our belief systems and our values expressed in the relationships between one another in equality in the economy.

The first speaker we have today is very knowledgeable about the demographic trends in the economy. Mr. Felix Contreras is currently the Deputy Regional Administrator and Director of the Office of Administration and Management Services for the San Francisco Office of the Employment and Training Administration of the United States Department of Labor.

MR. FELIX CONTRERAS: The Department of Labor, headquarted in Region IX in San Francisco, is that portion of the federal government that deals with unemployment insurance, employment service, job training programs, and to a certain extent, portions of the Immigration and Reform Act.

Although we're generally seen as bureaucrats, let me say that we've also embarked on a new kind of work for ourselves. Just recently we published "Work Force 2000", which has been quoted extensively by the past speakers. Normally, government publications go on a shelf; nobody reads them; an occasional researcher comes along and concludes something about them. But this publication has really gotten very wide circulation, in part, because the Department of Labor has taken on a new mission extensively talking about labor force trends, what we need to do about them, and some suggestions for necessary action. We're not prescribing particular programs, avenues, or means. What we're probably doing is the job that this Joint Select Committee is doing, and that's getting the word out. If we don't take heed, we're going to have a terrible mess on our hands. Some of those trend lines were explained by previous speakers.

It takes a long time for policies that are correct policies to come through a process. Generally people say that it takes about 15 years for an idea to come to fruition. We don't have that long. The year 2000 is just around the corner. If we talk about those people who are presently in school and will be in the labor force in a few years, we're going to have to make sure that those trend lines having to do with dropout rates, the illiteracy rates, and social needs do not continue. If, in fact, we let them continue without any kind of intervention, we'll have a situation with a reduced and ineffective work force. If we accept UNESCO's figures that a literate person is four times more productive than an illiterate person, you have made a strong case for correcting this outrageous situation. It makes no sense to continue letting people go to waste and be unproductive. The Workforce 2000 message has addressed a number of policy issues.

First, we should talk about stimulating growth in this country. This may seem like something other people do, that the Federal Reserve does, the Council of Economic Advisers does, or people somewhere in the Finance Committee. That's not the case; having a trained and intelligent work force, a flexible one, is a prime ingredient for an economy that is dynamic and able to respond very quickly and ably to the demands at hand. So it's not something that is left for somebody else to do. People in this room and in Region IX have been very interested in it. Other speakers are going to talk

about productivity in the service sector and the kinds of jobs involved. Let me suggest here that the service sector, or more accurately, the non-goods producing sector, is the largest sector that we have. It's not that manufacturing, goods producing, is less important. It's just that it has remained stable and probably will remain stable for a number of years and that the growth is in services and service jobs that we can't readily export to low-wage areas. It's very difficult for an educator in this country to have his/her services exported to Taiwan. It's also very difficult for persons in medical services to have their jobs transported to Singapore or South Korea. Economic productivity has not really increased and that is a real danger. The question really becomes, "What do we do about it?" Let me suggest that technology offers a real possibility in this area.

We recently concluded a major conference here in Los Angeles, together with the State Department of Education and the California Association of School Administrators at Wood/Hudson Institute which did the basic work on the Work Force 2000. At that conference we had a number of participants from private industry, education, and the trading establishments. They emphasized that we really need to investigate computer learning, videotape, interactive video, and all those emerging technologies that allow particular teachers to replicate themselves in different situations. We really should quickly pick up on tools that extend our productive value. Generally, increases in wages and benefits have come across in manufacturing and the services for those people who are more productive.

A number of speakers have talked about the aging work force and that certainly is true. California probably is slightly behind the work curve but still not far away from that. The rest of the country and rest of the region has serious problems in this regard, because they don't have the numbers of young people coming into the work force. We're going to have to be more dependent on people staying in the work force longer or somehow using more effectively the abilities of that retired work force or work force that probably would have retired. It would be wonderful to capture the resources of all those "Rossmores" out there rather than putting them behind walls and segregating them from the rest of the community, really making them the resource that you can depend on. There's been a lot of comment today in this conference about that.

The Work Force 2000 publication talks extensively about reconciling the needs of women, work, and the family. Other people are much more qualified to talk about the very dynamic area of this labor market issue. Whether it's work, flexible work, child care, benefits, equity wages -- those are all issues that policy makers need to address.

Another issue, and this one should be immediate to the people in this audience, is how do we integrate black and Hispanic workers into the labor force. All of you are familiar with those awful figures that talk about dropouts, illiteracy rates, and productive capability on the part of some of our citizens. How do we address this issue? In going around the country and talking to various groups, in essence, we have advised community leaders, "Recognize the issue and the figures, and do something about it. If it's important, then you will integrate that policy issue with the others that you have. How do you balance that against water policy and zoning and smog and land use and roads? It has to be done. How it's done in any particular area is going to be different. In our region, which includes

the four western states of California, Arizona, Nevada, Hawaii, and some other Pacific territories, we've seen it come about in different ways. Across the country, ten states have already designated Work Force 2000 commissions and they've gotten busy with the Youth 2000 task forces. They haven't launched programs yet but they're coming to the realization, they need to do something about it.

How do you integrate people that have been less participatory and less productive in the labor market and increase their value? For example, in Las Vegas, we launched together with the local community a program called "Citizens Interested in Today's Youth" (CITY). Here was an organization of very prominent individuals that really did not have a clear idea of what their mission was. We came along with the message called Youth 2000, Work Force 2000, and they said, "Yeah, that's something that we need to do." In fact, they've just concluded a major conference with every superintendent, many educators, juvenile court judges, and prominent members of the community and they're well underway. They just received large donations which will perpetuate them as an orgnanization.

We've worked with people in San Diego on the replication of the Boston Compact to help high school students get through school and have jobs waiting for them. In Sacramento we've worked with the Grant School District, a very deprived school district. Again we made contacts with them and rearranged the resources they have, and they're on their way. We've also worked with the national prototype model called "Cities and Schools" and one of their programs is in Long Beach.

The final policy goal that we have been addressing is how to improve the educational proficiency of all workers. How do we quickly retrain those people that are laid off with or without notice; how do we intervene in that process that says, "Fine, you've worked 19 years; now you have no job"? How do we quickly reintegrate those people back into the economy? Even in this tight budget year, there is a proposal in Congress as part of the Trade Act called "Worker Readustment". It is close a billion dollars. It would be a very quick response program that says if something is happening in a mining industry in Arizona or with Gemco in California, that we quickly go there to evaluate skills, redirect people to available jobs, retrain them where it's necessary, and provide services to allow that transition to take place. We have been very gratified by the kind of response that's been given to this Work Force 2000 policy agenda.

MS. TENINTY: We all are told not to worry about the loss of industrial jobs, even though we know that they pay more and provide benefits on the whole and produce real goods for which there are obvious markets like steel and cars and timber and so forth. We're told, "Don't worry because the future in America is in the information age and in the service economy." So we have to focus on that if that is to be our future. Yet two-thirds of all new jobs created during the first quarter of '87 were in the two lowest-paying categories of the service industry, retail trades, and health and business services, both which paid individuals working full time below what would be the poverty level.

Fortunately we have some very dedicated and talented union members here to speak not only on how the workers can readjust but how we can bring the employers into partnership in creating the future. First, I'd like to introduce Eliseo Medina who's the President of Local 102 of the Service Employees International Union based in San Diego. After Mr. Medina's testimony there will be three

other people who will testify with him and I will have him introduce them. But to preview those speakers, we'll hear from Hiliaria Velez who is married to Jesus Velez, who will also be testifying. They both work in the service industry as janitors. They're married with three children that they're trying to support. Also from a Los Angeles Local of Service Employees International Union, Local 434, is Susana Ferrell who is with the Home Care Workers Union.

MR. ELISEO MEDINA: I am Eliseo Medina, President of the Service Employees International Union, Local 102 in San Diego, California.

Our union represents over 2,000 working people in San Diego and Imperial Counties. Our members work as nursing assistants, food services workers, and maintenance workers in nursing homes caring for the elderly. They work as custodians, licensed vocational nurses, and clericals in hospitals caring for the sick and the disabled. They work as janitors in high-rise buildings, in theaters and supermarkets, keeping clean the buildings where many of the major decisions of this state are being made and in areas where we go for amusement, where we go to spend our spare time. They work as ushers, as ticket sellers, and security guards in stadiums, sports arenas, and race tracks. They work as bus drivers, teachers' aides, carpenters, and plumbers in the schools preparing the schools for the children, who are tomorrow's future. Over half of them are women, and our families are primarily two-earner families or families which are headed by women. What they all have in common is that they are all part of the fastest-growing segment of our economy, the service sector.

As jobs in manufacturing have declined -- the jobs in the steel mills and in other plants -- there has been an explosion in the service sector, in jobs which cannot be exported abroad because they provide services to people, not services to machines. For example, in San Diego County, jobs are projected to increase from 669,055 in 1988 to 897,828 jobs in 1990, an increase of 34 percent or 228,000 new jobs. Of these new jobs 68 percent will be in the service sector -- janitors, nursing assistants, gardeners, food preparation workers, hotel workers, laborers, et cetera. These workers face many serious problems on the job. They will generally be working at new jobs which will be minimum-wage jobs, currently paying between $3.35 and $3.50 an hour. They will have no benefits, such as state holidays, paid vacations, sick leave, medical insurance, nor pensions. Their employers are private companies or they may be contractors who are working under a subcontracting arrangement with public agencies, or they may be contracted directly by these public agencies (states, counties, and cities) as private contractors.

Many employers that we deal with in the service sectors have gone so far as to label their janitors as independent contractors in order to avoid payment of social security taxes, liability insurance, income tax withholding, unemployment insurance, and workers' compensation. I have with me, for example, a sample independent contractor agreement that a company in San Diego is asking janitors to sign. Mind you, we're not talking about consultants for running presidential campaigns. Nor are we talking about attorneys, and we're certainly not talking about engineers building bridges or buildings. We're talking about people who are cleaning the buildings. This independent contractor agreement says: "I agree to furnish the company a copy of my insurance policy and business license." Since when do you have a business license to clean buildings? It also says: "Further, I agree to act as

an independent agent to pay and handle my own income and withholding taxes. I also understand that no compensation insurance or unemployment benefits will be paid by the company for my behalf. I hereby accept the listed conditions ..."

Now as you know, according to state laws, when you work for an employer, the employer's supposed to pay workers' compensation if you get injured on the job so that you can get a medical pension and some income when you are unable to work. There's also a state law that says unemployment insurance is supposed to be available in the event employees lose their jobs so that they can get a little assistance until they can find a new job. However, this independent contractor agreement states that those things do not apply to the janitors the company employs which, in my opinion, is a total and complete violation of the State Labor Code and Federal Tax Law. But these employees, who do not enjoy union protection, are not aware of their rights, or they need their jobs so that they cannot complain because they will be fired. They're caught in a bad situation: No job or a job where they're just going to take their chances, where they could be hurt at any time and lose the ability to support their families, a job where if they lose it, they will not get unemployment compensation. In this manner, these employees are side-stepping the protections provided by California law. We are also seeing that many of the employers in the service sector who have provided benefits in the past are increasingly transforming their jobs into part-time positions, four to five hours rather than eight hours a day so that they can avoid the payment of benefits. These economic conditions can make a family increasingly vulnerable. It should not be necessary for a family to send more than one wage earner into the work force in order to provide a decent standard of living. When we were organizing downtown San Diego janitors, we found school kids working as janitors instead of staying home to study in order to help support their family. They report from 5:30 to 10:30 at night, five days a week. Under these conditions, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for children to take the time to be able to study, to learn, to prepare themselves for tomorrow.

We also found families who could not afford baby sitters so they took their children with them to help clean the buildings. They all said that they did not want to do this but they had to. The choice was either to take them to work or leave them alone at home as latchkey kids. It's not a particularly good choice that they face. Many of these families find themselves having to work two or three jobs just to keep their families housed and fed. I want to share with you just three examples of the kind of people that we're constantly dealing with.

The first one is a single mother; she's approximately 35 years old, has an 11-year-old daughter and her parents living with her. She gets up at 6 o'clock in the morning to prepare breakfast and get her daughter ready for school. After her daughter leaves, she then goes to her first job as a food service worker in a local school where she works six hours. She gets off in time to see her daughter home from school, prepares dinner, and gets ready to go to her second job as a janitor in a downtown office building. There she works six to eight hours per night and will return home between midnight and 1 o'clock in the morning to sleep a few hours before starting the routine all over again.

The second example is a group of eight janitors. Among them is a young married couple. They

have pooled their resources to be able to rent a two-room apartment for $500 a month. Actually, this is cheap by comparative standards. These janitors make between $350 and $400 a month a piece cleaning downtown buildings. So they simply do not earn enough to be able to buy food, clothing, and also pay for housing of their own. Thus they live together in a two-room apartment, not because they want to but because they have to. It's either that or sleep outside as one of the many homeless that we have in our society.

The third example is here in Los Angeles where 40,000 home care workers provide services to the elderly and the disabled. These elderly people need someone to do chores for them, such as buy groceries, clean their house, provide therapy, cook their meals. This is obviously a very important job, like taking care of our grandfathers and our grandmothers. Yet these committed workers are paid $3.72 per hour and receive no benefits. Most, again, are women with families. While the State of California and Los Angeles County rely on these people to deliver these critical services, neither one of them wants to take responsibility for providing decent wages or benefits. They treat these employees as independent providers, just the way a janitorial company does. These government agencies brag about their programs which keep people out of nursing homes and keep them at home, but they're doing it by paying poverty wages. In fact, many of these workers could make more money if they lived on welfare rather than by working. But they don't want public assistance. What they want is a job that pays decent wages and benefits so that they can support their families, not the state. They have been organizing in order to secure a voice on the job and deal with some of these critical issues directly with the County or State, whichever one happens to be the employer. So far, they're both denying their involvement and saying, "Neither one of us is the employer." They refuse to recognize the legitimate grievances. These examples illustrate the problems facing the family in the service sector. These conditions force a mother or father, and in some cases both, to be at work 12 to 15 hours per day just to provide for their children's physical needs without allowing them time to provide nurturing, guidance, and emotional support necessary to establish a viable and stable family. These economic conditions create a situation where the children are not receiving the care, attention, and high-quality education that they need to become California's future leaders.

Our union has been in the forefront of efforts to organize service workers so that they, through the collective bargaining process, can address some of these issues themselves and develop self-determination, the ability to have a voice in those decisions which affect their daily working lives. For example, in downtown San Diego, janitorial wages have declined from a full-time job at $5.35 per hour with benefits in 1981 to a part-time job at $3.35 per hour and no benefits in 1987. Because of these conditions, the turnover rate has skyrocketed. Basically workers who get those jobs stay on average three months only as long as it takes them to find a better job. This hurts not only the workers but also the employer who has to contend with continuing recruitment and training costs as well as the resultant loss in productivity. When we began organizing the janitors, we met a lot of resistance from the employers. About 20 janitors were fired; many were threatened with termination because of their union activities. Then we filed charges with federal agencies and won most of them. People were reinstated. Finally we organized about 70 percent of employers and began to negotiate a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

contract.

One month ago we concluded the negotiations for a downtown leasing agreement. Wages increased from $3.50 an hour to $4.50 an hour. We won paid sick leave, holidays, vacations, and many other benefits. Yet the most important benefit that they have won is some voice in those decisions which are being made by their employers, without any thought as to how they impact on the the employees. We have not only been able to raise wages and win benefits for all workers, part time and full time, but we have also addressed through our collective bargaining efforts issues such as parental leave, pensions, health insurance, and participating in a training program. While fighting for decent wages at the bargaining table, we have also supported legislative efforts to raise the minimum wage, to enforce child labor laws, to eliminate discrimination in employment, to provide income protection benefits, and to provide adequate health care to workers. There is no doubt that collective bargaining plays a very vital role in providing a better standard of living for workers. Yet it cannot take the place of an overall commitment by our society to protect and nurture the family. I believe that we can have a society that provides a job at a decent wage for all who want to work and also provides services and benefits which are essential for a decent standard of living. But we can only accomplish this if labor, business, and government work together. Employers need to be more responsive to the changing work force and more sensitive to the needs of their employees. We believe this not only makes good business sense because, as you know, satisfied employees are much more productive and committed to the success of their employers than those who feel they have no stake in their job and that they're just treated as an expendible part of the operation. It also is efficient. It eliminates recruitment, retraining costs, and the time and cost of training a new worker with resulting loss of productivity. It's to the best interest of the employers to address these issues. I believe also that government must take action to assure that protection of the family becomes public policy. Our legislative leaders need to take the lead by making this a priority in the public debate and working to address legislation to implement family-related legislation. Issues, such as parental leave, adequate minimum wage, pay equity, strengthening laws which give workers the right to organize, free from coercion or intimidation, laws that provide for health insurance protection, and child care provisions -- all of these make sense, not only for the family but for California. They are an investment in our future, one that will pay dividends that will benefit all of us.

I'd like now to introduce now Jesus Velez and Hilaria Velez who are from San Diego who work as janitors in downtown San Diego.

MRS. HILARIA VELEZ: (Translated) I'm very happy with the job where I work but the pay is very low. There are nine people in my family who live in the same house. I don't see much of my children at home because I have to go to work. My husband has two jobs, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. My children do not like me to work. They cry when I leave but I have to do it. Rent is very high, food is very expensive, and I need to work. I would like to get better wages. Where I work, I get paid $3.75 an hour and need to commute half an hour to get to work.

I hope that you can help us for the benefit of everyone, my children and everybody that needs improvement.

MR. JESUS VELEZ: My name is Jesus Velez. I'm from San Diego. I would like to tell you we need work; we don't want stamps or welfare. What we want is work with benefits and better wages, just as my wife has already said.

MR. MEDINA: At this time I'd like to introduce Susana Ferrell who's a home care worker here in Los Angeles.

MS. SUSANA FERRELL: My name is Susana Ferrell and I am a home care worker. They call us the "home worker", but I don't consider myself a home worker. First of all, we go into people's houses and take care of them. We give them love because that's mostly what they need, love and understanding. They don't get that from their families; they don't get it from anybody. We have to give it to them. Second, we take care of them like nurses, like doctors do sometimes. We have to do therapy, psychologically, mentally; and most of all, to the blind people we have to teach them. We learn ourselves how to treat a blind person. That is very hard to do because you have to understand how a blind person feels. Third, we don't get recognition from anybody and that is hurting us and our clients, because there are 50,000 people who need our services. We are only 4,000 workers. How do we manage? We have to manage one way or the other, otherwise these people won't have our care and our love.

I myself have three children; I take care of my daughter who has diabetes and other complications. The government pays me only $51 a month to take care of her and I have to give her injections. I don't have the knowledge to do that; I'm not a nurse. But I had to learn to do that, otherwise she would die. The government doesn't care; they don't care how we feel or how the client feels. We're not selfish. We don't want the union just for ourselves; we don't want benefits just for ourselves. We want it for our clients also because the sick people are growing in number. We're not saying that people are not going to get sick anymore or that there won't be old people anymore to take care of. Unfortunately we are all growing old and we all need to have this understanding. We need recognition from the county; we need help.

We only earn $3.72 an hour and don't get any mileage. We do their groceries; we take them to the doctor. We take them out because they need to go out. They don't like to stay at home. so we have to manage to take them on wheelchairs, walkers, whatever. This situation is hurting us so much because nobody wants to hear us. Everybody's closing the doors on us. We have to open the doors; we have to fight and open the door. And I guess I'm a fighter and I will do it.

MS. TENINTY: Eliseo, Hilaria, Jesus, and Susana represent a trend, where the majority of growing and available jobs, and conditions for those jobs, portend the disappearance of the middle class, the fact that for every one person who moves into the middle class four people are falling out because of the conditions and availabilities of jobs. The one thing we hoped we learned from our previous speakers is that through collective action and participation we may be able to change our futures.

The next speaker is Tom Coleman who is a Special Consultant to the Los Angeles City Task Force on Family Diversity. He's also on the Joint Select Task Force on the Changing Family. He's going to be talking about how the economy affects relationships, that is, couples' abilities to get

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

together and to be respected in a way that they can stay together as well as the process by which we develop solutions.

MR. TOM COLEMAN: I want to share with you something of the process that I and 36 other people have been through over the past couple of years and then talk a little bit about the process that's going on here and how important it is, then I'll move into some specific problems that affect families and couples and what we might be able to do to improve the situation for families. In April of 1986, Councilman Michael Woo signed a mandate and created a local task force on Family Diversity; he appointed 36 people to serve on this task force, people from around the City of Los Angeles from various backgrounds and walks of life, political persuasions and religious persuasions and so on. Although I wasn't a member of the group, I was asked by Councilman Woo to be a consultant to the group, to assist them in this study, and to make sure that it had integrity, so that it would really address the major problems that are affecting families in Los Angeles. In going through this process with 36 people it's been a real eye opener, especially in a city like Los Angeles where there is a real mixture and no one dominant family form. Everyone is a minority now; everyone is a racial, ethnic, religious minority. Married couples are a minority. Everyone now in Los Angeles is a minority; we're all in the same boat. The only way we're going to get ahead is by not fighting one another or trying to get ahead of one another but rather working together as a family would work together. This task force had a public/private partnership, with the city assisting in some administrative matters and then with further help from private-sector agencies and some public utilities (General Telephone, Pacific Bell). The episcopal dioceses of Los Angeles and other organizations also helped fund us and worked along with us in this endeavor. We were fortunate to have students from Cal State Northridge and the University of Southern California Law Center doing research in the initial stages, and then we opened up the process to the public, families, and service providers and held public hearings just like this one. In our four public hearings we had 50 witnesses testify and suggest what we might do. The task force members themselves did research papers and submitted recommendations to the group. After some deliberation we wrote a draft report which will soon be shared with public officials, private-sector leaders, the general public and the media to present our findings and recommendations.

A number of things we've learned from this process. One is that the problems of families are really inter-governmental problems that can only be solved through public/private partnerships. They're inter-governmental in that no one branch or agency of government can solve the problems. The federal government must participate, also the state and local government. The judiciary and legislators must participate; both the public and the private sector. In the private sector, we need participation from religious organizations, educational institutions, the corporate sector, and so on. Thus what we've learned is that all these changes and problems exist; and all the participants must work together as a family would work together. The process of identifying the problems and making recommendations is critical. It must be a process involving a lot of openness and integrity. People must have an open mind, whereby through this process we reevaluate our assumptions and take another look at the definitions that we've been relying on, such as the definition of family and what it

means today. We look at current demographics and current problems to see what is actually happening out there in the world rather than what we have in our mind, and the myths and stereotypes that we've been living with, or what we would like it to be. All of this process, of course, is done in a context of respect for tradition. Tradition has a role to play. It is a foundation upon which we're building but it should never be a straight-jacket that prevents us from actually solving real problems for real people.

With all of this in mind I would like to tell you some of the problem areas that we have identified, but it's not comprehensive because the conference doesn't permit it. We are making 110 recommendations in the report. It's a several hundred page report. But there are some economic areas that I think are worthy of hearing right now. Part of it is in the employment area. Of course, the minimum wage being too low, we need to keep pressing for a higher minimum wage, because without pressing for it, it never happens. We've seen some advances in that area but still the minimum wage hasn't changed; there's still many people at or below the poverty line.

The benefit systems that many employers use, when they have benefit systems, are built on an outdated model of the family, and they're not really serving the needs of people; they're not serving dual-wage earner families; they don't need four health benefit plans if both people are working. They might prefer to have few health benefit plans and provision for child care or elderly dependent care, or some other type of benefits. However we need to prod and encourage the public- and private-sector employers to move more into the flexible benefit plans or cafeteria-style benefits that can allow the diverse family forms that exist to have their needs satisfied.

The leave policies (the sick leave, bereavement leave, family dependent leave, and so on) are not extensive enough; they're too restrictive; for example, the City of Los Angeles has a rather generous leave policy. However, it is not addressing the needs of unmarried couples or gay and lesbian couples, so that a couple, say a gay couple, have been together for 20 years and one of the partners dies; he can clearly not take off legally and get bereavement leave for a partner of 20 years because they're not in the definition of a family that the city has in the leave policy. So we need to look at these issues and suggestions to address the needs of a diverse family structure in Los Angeles.

With respect to the issue of housing, housing is generally unaffordable; it's inadequate in terms of size. We're building all these one-bedroom apartments, and we don't need more one-bedroom apartments in Los Angeles. We need three- and four-bedroom apartments. So the adequacy of the size of housing is something to be addressed. Housing discrimination is another area -- it's an economic issue, it's social too; but it's also economic because discrimination against families with children, or people who are disabled or unmarried couples affects those people in some very substantial economic ways.

The area of insurance -- we are all clamoring for insurance reform. And unfortunately the legislature has been unable to act, to deliver that reform. So we the people are going to take the matter into our own hands and exercise our rights through the initiative process and we're going to have a cafeteria of selections on the ballot, but reform needs to occur because we must be insured in order to drive under the law. Yet many of us cannot afford it, so we need some type of reform there.

In the area of insurance there was also a lot of discrimination, red-lining and what we call "lifestyle discrimination", against unmarried couples or gay and lesbian couples. That needs to be eliminated. Child care, of course, is a major area of concern for families, especially people who are working and who need to have it more available, more affordable, and have quality child care.

The area of victims' rights and survivors' rights is another issue I wanted to mention because it's something that's often overlooked as an economic area. As an example suppose an unmarried couple or a gay and lesbian couple are driving along the street and a drunk driver hits the car and maybe the people have been together in a long-term relationship (10, 15, 20 years) and the primary breadwinner is killed. The survivor in this unmarried relationship is not permitted to sue the drunk driver for wrongful death, the loss of that relationship or the loss of that income. We need some additional reforms in the wrongful death statues.

Marriage penalties exist for seniors and disabled people. Many seniors and many disabled people would like to get married but they can't because if they get married, they will lose benefits that they have accrued through perhaps a previous marriage of 25 yeras or whatever. Let's say a woman in her 60s is surviving on survivor benefits, pension plan or social security. If she remarries, she loses the benefits. So there are many senior couples that are living as unmarried couples even though they would rather be married. We need some reforms in that area, and that same situation exists for disabled couples.

Basically the message that I wish to leave you with is that we are a cohesive family unit, a social unit, and we need to work together. Married people, families with children, families with elders or disabled people, step families, foster families, immigrant families, families of color, gay and lesbian couples, and all families must work together. We should join hands in a process that has integrity, that really looks at things and then move together jointly and cohesively as a family unit, not at the expense of one another, not one running ahead of one another, but together we should move forward to solve these economic problems. I believe that we can do it.

MS. TENINTY: Our next speaker is Beverly Sheldon who is here from the Traditional Values Coalition. She'll be speaking about the need for choices regarding working, particularly for parents with preschool children. Since I work at the Graduate Theological Union, which is the consortium of 14 different religions training priests, rabbis, and ministers for communities all around the United States, we have a lot of debates about traditional values. In fact it has been said that there is the dead tradition of the living, which Tom Coleman refers to as the straightjacket, or there's the living tradition of the dead which uses the building blocks of tradition which are so important to society and interprets that tradition for the conditions of the present.

MS. BEVERLY SHELDON: I feel like I'm speaking today for a vanishing breed, maybe in the sense of the condor whose eggs are protected. Maybe we need some of that today for the old, traditional mother. I guess I was that kind of mother; I'm a mother of four and a grandmother of three now. I'm coming into a new kind of a lifestyle, you might say.

Today I'm speaking for two groups of women, women who wish they didn't have to work and women who are choosing not to work at great sacrifice for some of the things that we might call

luxaries or that some people might even call necessities. Changing family economics is making a change in what we have done and what mothers have done over past years. I have been a minister's wife for a long time in my life and have had small group discussions with many young mothers. Many of them talk about how badly they want to stay home, especially with their preschoolers. So we discuss the many things they can do in order to make that happen -- how you can buy low-cost meats, sew your children's clothes, learn how to shop, use second-hand clothing, and how you can live in an apartment that would cost much less than where you'd like to be living. That's what a lot of people are doing so that the mothers can stay home, especially with their preschool children. So I feel that we should take this group of people into account when we are looking at the demographics of change and the people that we're talking about.

Yesterday Ed Zigler, who started Head Start, stated that over 50 percent of preschool mothers are working today. Well, that means that a little less than 50 percent of the mothers are not working today. Of the mothers that are working, 35 percent work full time; that would mean that 20 percent work part time. I know many mothers who work a little part time and do baby-sitting in their homes. Women do lots of part-time work to take care of their children and to be at home with them.

Yale University did a study on couples where both the mother and father worked full time. They found that two-thirds of these mothers wished they didn't have to work full time. Over 60 percent of the spouses of these women also wished that their wives didn't have to work full time. Apparently a lot of working mothers wished they didn't have to and many are trying hard to find ways in which they can stay at home. I hope that this task force can include studies that would help mothers to be able to stay at home, if that's what they choose to do. I fully believe that if women want to work, they ought to have that choice. At the same time if they would like to just stay home, especially with their preschoolers, we should try and help them have that option.

A study at Boston University discovered a higher degree of vulnerability among parents who both work than those where only the husband works. It was evidenced in decreased physical and emotional well-being as measured by depression measures, decreased life satisfaction, and lowered health and energy levels, all of which amounted to a day's absence in work. As a consequence, the total family suffers. I know how difficult it was for me to go to work, although my children are grown now. However, I do take care of my 97-year-old mother. She goes to work with me every day and she lives with us. She even wanted to come with me today. So I'd like to say that there are many mothers who don't want to be working and I'd like to see how we can help them.

Even though we've talked a lot about single-parent families, I want to remind you that there are no single-parent children, and I think that's where a lot of the trouble comes from. Maybe government can take a stronger position to help children not to be one-parent children. We may live in a one-parent family but we don't have any one-parent children. Perhaps the task force can examine this issue.

I would like to suggest that the task force consider how to keep the money in the home, that is, the earnings of the primary breadwinner. Thus, if the father is working and the mother wants to stay home with preschool children, how can we help them do that? One way might be to have less taxes

taken out of the salary of young fathers or delayed payment until a later time. Perhaps we can have more deductions for children in a family. We all know that it costs more than a thousand dollars a year to take care of a child. So I'd just like to place these suggestions before the task force and have them remember the many women who wish they could be at home with their children and those who are staying at home with their children, and doing without many material things.

MS. TENINTY: To give families that choice, we're going to have to increase wages. Young college graduates' wages declined 11 percent between '73 and '84; and for young men who have their high school diplomas, earnings have declined 30 percent. If you are a young man between the ages of 20 and 24 but did not complete high school, your wages have dropped 45 percent. In other words, two-thirds of the working women today are either their family's sole support or married to men who make less than $15,000 a year, which definitely cuts down your choices.

Our next speaker is Colleen Fahey-Fearn who's an attorney. She is a board member of the Women's Economic Agenda Project, an organization that's been important in California in developing family policy and legislation to make the changes we need in our state. She's going to be speaking about women and children who are alone and in poverty.

MS. COLLEEN FAHEY-FEARN: We at the Women's Economic Agenda Project think that the issue of homeless children is so urgent that our policy makers must take action. This situation has to stop now. I want you to remember the number of children that are homeless in this society. I think it is unconscionable that this society can tolerate homeless children. We may have been able to tolerate homeless men when we thought that they were all winos and homeless women when we thought that they were all bag ladies, and both homeless men and women when we thought that they were all mentally ill. But we simply cannot tolerate homeless children.

When I was a young woman, I used to read about Dickens' characters and the miserable childhoods they had. Then I felt very happy that I wasn't part of that era and that it was a part of some cultures that I thought had uncaring governmental policies. Today however the United States carries the distinction of being the first society in the history of mankind in which our children are worse off than our adults. I'm not talking about an insignificant number of children. I'm talking about 13.8 million children who live in poverty, and many of them are homeless, as you will know later.

I'm going to read you a litany now that I got from very prominent sources, Time, Newsweek, The New Yorker, and from my own personal experience. So I didn't make these things up. These children of poverty are hit the hardest; they are very familiar with watered-down bottles, milk bottles without formula, no immunizations (measles is on the rise now), no polio vaccinations, no diphtheria vaccinations. The fetus even suffers. The WIC (Women, Infants and Children) program has been cut severely. Because of no prenatal care the low birth rate has gone up dramatically. We also have a very high infant mortality, as Congresswoman Schroeder told us. Excessive illness is running rampant among our poverty children; illnesses like lead poisoning and anemia have increased dramatically. There's no dental care; rotting front teeth are often reported. Depression, lethargy, and missed school are common in these children. There's school being missed. There's no school at

all if you happen to be on the streets. Many school children try to study on empty stomachs; programs for school lunches, school breakfasts, even school milk programs have been eliminated.

The budget cuts that occurred in 1981 and since then have affected eight million children. These children are familiar with evictions and they're on the streets; they are very accustomed to noisy and dangerous shelters. Sadly, welfare hotels have become so institutionalized that we are raising a generation of children in these shelters. Less important, although very important to the children, I'm sure, is that they have no Christmas, no Christmas presents, no birthdays, no birthday parties, only dreary surroundings and stigmatised in school, as described in the report being called "Dirty Babies". They're handicapped emotionally and slow learners; they're either passive or they're hyperactive in school. They're accustomed to used clothes, no shoes, overflowing sewage from communal bathrooms that they have to use, government cheese, no braces, no special lessons. "Hallway children" are those children who are too large to be kept in their room and too young to go outside and deal with the drug users. Shelters deal with violence all the time and the children must deal with high-stress parents, parents who are somewhat broken, maybe into drugs or even suffering from stress abuse.

Those facts do not come from a Dickens book. I got them from common sources that anybody can read here in the United States. They also come from my own personal experience, because how can I forget Barbara's face? She is a grandmother in her 50s. When her adult daughter died, she got those two children, who were eight and nine, together with her own ten-year-old. After working for the post office for 15 years, she retired and got a lump-sum retirement which was enough maybe to buy a home, for herself and the children. New welfare rules since 1981 however cut her and the children off for one year. They lived in cars for the next eight months until she finally got help by going to the Western Center on Urban Poverty but she's ended up with a broken family. She cries all the time and reports that the child who suffered the most now sits in school passively and cries and laughs inappropriately. Childhood misery has become so institutionalized that I'm afraid it's going to be another trivia game, although it's not a trivial matter. You know, how many homeless are there in the United States? How many in California? How many in San Diego, which is where I'm from. How many by the year 2000? That sounds like a game that perhaps I could win. As I mentioned, it's not an insignificant number. It's 13.8 million children that are now on poverty.

But if you don't remember anything else, please, remember when you go home: Homeless families, generally a female with two children because that's the average, are the fastest increasing segment amongst the homeless population. How are we going to tell how many homeless children we have? It goes like this: How many homeless are there altogether in the United States? Well, it all depends on who you talk to. The Department of Health and Human Services says there's two million. President Reagan says 350,000. The Homeless Coalition says three million. Doonesbury Cartoon attributes the White House as saying that there aren't any; there's simply two million campers. Let's say that there's two million because that's the government's own estimate. What percentage of them are homeless families? The magazines tell you 30 percent; the Homeless Coalition says 40 percent. So let's go with 35 percent, that is, 35 percent of two million are homeless families. Keep in mind

that there are 350,000 homeless families in this nation. That's 116,000+ females and 233,000+ children. So remember 233,000+ children. Why are so many children homeless? Why does this happen? It's simple. Single-parent families headed by females have doubled since 1969. Homeless children and children in poverty have doubled since 1979. It all fits together well. These people are operating under an economy that keeps them in poverty.

I want to say just a few words about childhood wrath. We are creating a generation of diseased, distraught, and under-educated, malnourished children. The immediate result is stunted growth and lack of brain development. The long-term result is unemployable and angry adults. Although many of us came from tough backgrounds, we don't know what it's like to survive on the streets and deal with the dangers there. I don't think that Ellen Bassett, in her study on Boston shelters, will ever forget the child who pulled out all of his permanent teeth in the middle of a rage turned inward. There is such a thing as childhood wrath and we must not forget it.

In addition to what I've already said, I want to tell you about the 1981 massive Welfare Reform Act that I think was the most cataclysmic thing that ever came down for our children in the United States. The war on poverty, which some of you may remember, became in 1981 the war on children. This legislative gun was aimed at the poor working class, which means the working woman. That's the woman who's on AFDC; she has such a low, dead-end job, that she also gets a small AFDC check to supplement her income and uses it usually for child care. As a result 500,000 women and children were thrown out on the streets. The new eligibility rules did not allow such women to take all of their expenses, including a lot of their child care and work expenses. Consequently 600,000 children were knocked off the Medi-Cal rolls in 1981. Women and children were denied food stamps, eight million as of now. The task was easy because the average age of the recipient is seven years and they can't fight back. Now wonder children are the fastest-growing homeless population.

The second gun that was aimed in this war on the children is probably the most dangerous because it is the most deceptive. That happens to be Workfare. It's proposed as a new idea, although it was an idea that's been around since 1601 when laws in England forced welfare recipients to work or else receive nothing. Now you have to work or else you're going to be sanctioned. Sanctions can be three months to six months if you do something wrong, which means eviction as a homeless person again. In 1972 California, under then Governor Reagan, tried it in an experiment where half the counties had it. At the end of three years, the counties that had Workfare had more applicants than recipients. Therefore Governor Brown, when he became governor, shelved the program. Never mind, it's coming up again. San Diego embraced it eagerly in 1982; the State of California has embraced it eagerly in 1985. It's called GAIN, Greater Avenues to Independence.

In any event, right now, as we speak, the Congress of the United States is also putting together a massive welfare reform program with Workfare as their centerpiece although their Workfare is a little bit different from ours. Their Workfare says that the woman must go out and work for her benefits or suffer the sanctions when the youngest child turns three, in the Democrats' version, or when the youngest child turns six months, according to the Republican bill. With all of these acronyms, Network and GAIN and things like that, we who are familiar with the program and work in

it, often like to call it Project Fat Chance.

First of all, Workfare is easy to sell politically because people think that they're saving money. Just recently the Governor had to give $2 million more to the program because it was costing much more than he expected. Incidentally, they don't have GAIN yet in Los Angeles or San Francisco so we don't have our two largest areas and yet it is costing that much more than they originally anticipated. For the first time, we are making welfare recipients work rather than encouraging them to do so. And why is this? It's because we believe the myth that the welfare mother is lazy, has a large brood in order to increase her welfare check, and that she won't take a job even if you hand her one. The actuality, of course, is that she is not a minority as they think. The average welfare recipient is Anglo, has 1.9 children, and is on welfare for approximately 18 months. There is no such thing as inter-generational dependency.

The studies indicate that the welfare woman does work and will work. The problem is that the government takes snapshot studies and they look at any one month. Then, they'll say, "My goodness, only 5 percent work. That means the other 95 percent must not be working." But the problem is that the welfare woman, by taking any job she can get, is normally in and out of jobs throughout the year. So if you take her during that year, you see 62 percent work. Now that's a big jump. In addition I told you about the 500,000 that were thrown out in the streets recently. In order to justify their new welfare reform program in Congress, the government is saying that we must have Workfare because they're finding that the AFDC woman doesn't work anymore. That's after they threw them off of AFDC and it is totally absurd.

Now one of the biggest problems in the Workfare that I'm just going to end with concerns displacement. The Union report on San Diego's Workfare said that there was some displacement. They said, however, that people who were displaced probably found another job. I think the problem is that women displace women and that if you are in a low-paying job and get displaced, then you go on welfare and you have to try Workfare, and you start working for free at the same job for which you used to get paid. In conclusion I want you to forget about men and women and just focus on the children. Can we state that there's 235,000 children on our streets? With the present trends, if we wait till the year 2000, we may have 5 million.

I just want to leave you with one message. It's a popular song that matches what we're talking about today. It's Whitney Houston's song, and it's perfect when she says: "We believe the children are our future. We believe the children will lead the way. We must teach them to look inside themselves and see the beauty inside of them." So if we do, then they will lead with dignity and physical, moral, and emotional health. I say let's invest in our future, our children.

MS. TENINTY: The next speaker is Dorcea Mayden, a mother who presently lives in a downtown hotel. She'll tell us a little bit about downtown parents.

MS. DORCEA MAYDEN: My children and I have been homeless for nearly nine years. With the exception of three months, I've raised my children, who are now eight- and ten-years-old, in hotels and shelter in downtown L.A. since June of '79. For 18 months, I worked as a teacher's aide for La Jolla Unified School District, but my job was discontinued. Because of my eye problems, I am

presently unemployed.

Today some of my goals are to continue to improve my education in order to help the homeless, become a free-lance writer, and most important, become a taxpayer for more years than I was a taxpayer's dependent. It delights me to tell you that in spite of their living situation, most homeless children attend school often and are very much involved in programs that are in or near the area they're living homeless in. The majority of us, homeless parents put forth efforts to keep our children in community programs. Most of us would prefer to do so while living in a better place.

Before allowing a tenant to move into an apartment that's maintained, the average landlord wants at least $1,500. In California most homeless parents receive an AFDC check once a month. We pay the rent for a place that we can afford; then we buy the things that our family are most in need of. Most of us don't have enough money left over to save the $1,500. It would be a wonderful act if the Asian community property owners would rent a number of those beautiful, newly built apartments in the downtown L.A. to homeless families. It would be a good deed because it's fulfilling a need.

MS. TENINTY: Several corporations have submitted testimony in writing: TRW, Lockheed, several department stores, and the Pasadena City Private/Public Coalition on Child Care. They are testifying about programs that they have designed and are implementing in order to help California families either at the work site or in a town where that corporation is located. When the testimony and the hearings come out in written form, you'll find this information useful in terms of model programs for the private sector.

Our final speaker is Linda Tarr-Whelan, President and Excecutive Director of the National Center for Policy Alternatives in Washington, D.C. We all know we're living in an international economy. It's been referred to in a number of ways but we all know it's here. Now Linda is going to place our family policy in an international context since she's just spent several months in Japan.

MS. LINDA TARR-WHELAN: I feel very privileged to be with Californians who should feel extremely proud of this unique process. You live in the only state with legislators who care enough to be caring about the family in the year 2000 and I think that you should be very proud of that. We talk about this example all across the country in hopes that other states will also begin to take a look at the concerns that working people and families have throughout the U.S. I'd also like to recognize a member of my National Advisory Board, Ethel Long-Scott, the Co-Director of the Women's Economic Agenda Project. Ethel is down from Oakland today.

I want to talk briefly about international comparisons because we hear very frequently that the United States cannot afford family policies, not only from corporations but from governments, whether it's the federal or the state government. I think that's absolutely dead wrong. If we are going to develop a competitive work force in this country to compete with other countries in the world, we must recognize that we are the only country which is not paying attention to families. I'd like to talk about that in the context of a trip that I made to Japan. I was fortunate enough to be named a Japan Leadership Fellow and I spent two-and-a-half months there visiting Japanese homes, meeting with workers in factories, day care centers, and hospitals, and I had an opportunity to work

in a Japanese office during my visit. It made me come back and do some research here to look at the United States and its preparations for a competitive work force compared not only to Japan but other countries.

We're clearly living in a society where the position of the work force is altered. The structure of our economy has clearly been transformed and the demographics of our population are changing as revealed by the statistics presented today. Yet we're clearly the only country that is not dealing with those facts in a way to prepare our work force of the future. We talk a lot about getting enough capital and about savings rates. We talk all kinds of competitive jargon in Washington. Yet we're only talking about our work force in limited terms, education and training. But we must talk about family policies. I'm more comfortable myself talking about family policies in a concept that is humane and just, and good for both children and parents; but that's not the bottom line in politics today. Although I resent it, I think we must make our arguments in competitive and economic terms; and the arguments make equally good sense there.

When I went to Japan, I was asked a number of questions about what's going on with the family policy in the United States. So I would begin by saying, "Well, we have a family and medical leave bill up before the United States Congress." Then they'd say, "Oh, good. Now how many weeks is it?" When I said, "Well, it's 18 weeks," they asked, "Well, how much is the government going to pay?" Then I had to say, "Oh, no, this is unpaid family leave." In Japan the government pays 60 percent of the salary of the woman who is taking leave and many employers pay up to a hundred percent, and the program is an 18-week program. So they ask, "Why don't you have this kind of program in the United States?" I explained, "Our business community is opposed and they are fighting very vigorously at the level of the National Chamber of Commerce against it." Then the businessman in Japan said, "I don't understand. Isn't that bad for the economy? Isn't that bad for the preparation of the work force? How do you give your children a good start?" So we started to talk about the kinds of things that exist in Japan as policies. Their policies are a good reason why statistics there are very different from statistics here.

First of all, 96 percent of all Japanese children graduate from high school. (They have no talking in Japanese schools, incidentally.) Just to compare that with American figures in this state, which is 41st in the United States, 66 percent of the students graduate from high school. We have an enormous gap with the best state of the United States -- Minnesota, where 92 percent graduate from high school, and in Louisiana, with only 54 percent graduating. So what it means is that Japan has family-support policies that start with paid maternity leave and day care is provided for all parents in the public center. No parent pays more than half because the government picks up the other half, and it's a sliding scale for them, with many parents paying nothing at all for child care. The kinds of payoff that you get when you care about these kinds of issues is that it is absolutely safe on the streets of Japan to go anywhere, anytime, without worrying about personal safety. I've traveled by myself throughout the country. I got off subway trains at 3 o'clock in the morning. I've traveled in the country, in the city, and any area of Tokyo, and there is no problem of safety in Japan. Also when you look at what the payoff is, you look at the infant mortality rates which were quoted here by

Congresswoman Schroeder. The United States is 19th in the world in infant mortality, but for black babies we're 28th in the world. Japan ties for first place.

I believe that our industrial competitors -- Japan, West Germany, Italy, France -- those are the countries that I included in my testimony -- made the investment in supports of families. Now they are having many more women come into the work force. Many women, for example, in occupations of shortage in this country, like scientist occupations, have doubled in Japan in the last few years. Our competitors have in place the structure that can help families and that help workers become productive or be even more productive. Thus as a country which cares about its own economic future we should be caring very much about family policies. I believe the question should be not, "Can we afford family policies," but, "Can we afford not to have family policies?"

MS. TENINTY: The question of international competition raises the questions of who wins, what price are you willing to pay to win (which the Japanese have paid a great cost to become the number one competitor in the economy), and why must there be a loser? Perhaps we need to think in terms of the great advances in technology which may help us at the local economy to use and harness that new knowledge and technology for far-reaching cooperation rather than competition, and really bring forth the values of the human family on the planet.

CO-CHAIRWOMAN WATSON: I want to particularly thank this panel and, in particular, Ms. Colleen Fahey-Fearn for the fine job that you have done. We are now ready to take public testimony. Susan Andres with Wages for Housework Campaign, would you come forth?

MS. SUSAN ANDRES: I'm presenting today a summary of testimony that was submitted by the International Black Women for Wages for Housework and the International Wages for Housework Campaign to the Senate Finance Committee, for consideration in the Welfare Reform Act proposed by Senator Moynihan, that is, the Family Security Act Bill 1511, which we opposed. I would like to submit our full testimony for the record.

Our summary is called "Every Mother is a Working Mother". By way of introduction I would like to say tha so-called "welfare reform", as it's being proposed at the national and state level, is not welfare reform; it is welfare destruction. Its main thrust is to force women to participate in mandatory work and training programs in order to collect welfare. The proponents of Workfare claim to have the best interests of women and children in mind. In fact, the opposite is the case. However, a growing movement of women are fighting to establish the economic value of housework. They joined with the Wages for Housework Campaign at the U.N. and the Deputy Conference on Women in Nairobi, Kenya, in 1985 to successfully press governments internationally, including the U.S., to agree to begin to count all women's work both waged and unwaged in the home and on the land in the gross national product of all countries. One study on the value of housework has estimated that in the U.S. alone, our unwaged work in the homes is worth $700 billion a year.

When you compare that figure to the pitiful amounts that we get back through welfare and in benefits, who is dependent on whom? We're producing $700 billion worth of wealth in this country a year and we're getting very little back. The welfare reform legislation proposed by Senator Moynihan does not acknowledge the fact that women, including welfare mothers, are already working in the

home and that Workfare is, in fact, a forced second job. What we get back is pitifully small. I've heard a lot here today about the value of parenting. Workfare does not value parenting. It doesn't recognize that raising children is work and it's valuable work. Everyone here has spoken about children being the future generation. Well, what about the people who are doing the work of raising the future generation?

Proponents of Workfare justify forcing welfare mothers into a second job by saying it's now normal, even for women with small children, to work two jobs -- one inside the home and one out. Are they saying it's normal for men to work two jobs? They are quick to point out that 62 percent of married women with children work outside the home. What they don't say is that only 29 percent of these women work outside the home full time the year around. They don't say that 80 percent of married women in wage jobs are forced to work the double day because the men they are with earn less than $20,000 a year. Unlike most Western countries, the U.S. has no system of family allowance payments to women with children. In the '60s the Welfare Rights Movement, mainly led by black women, made the case that housework is a job and that welfare is their right, not a charity. Welfare is the only money women in the U.S. get in their own right for their work, homemaking and child rearing. It has provided women with an insurance policy against complete dependence on men, but that alarms the policy makers in Washington.

Although women are angry about men who don't pay child support, they don't think the solution is to force every woman to name at birth the father of her child, but that is what the Family Security Act, the Moynihan bill, requires. It will require states to collect social security numbers from the parents at the time of birth. It mandates more rigorous paternity testing. It eliminates AFDC and substitutes in part child support payments which would be withheld from the man's wages, making women and children more dependent on men with whom they may want nothing to do, making them more vulnerable to violence at the hands of men and making it virtually impossible for immigrant children with fathers living abroad to be eligible for AFDC. It also sets a policy on race and gender. In other words, it is a racist and sexist piece of legislation by requiring welfare mothers to work off the difference between the child support check from the father and the total welfare check, which is what this Family Security Act will do. The legislation will unfairly impact women from poor, black, and immigrant communities because they'll be required to work the longest hours as child support payments are generally based on the man's income and men from poor, black, and immigrant communities are likely to have a lower income than people from affluent communities. It's a fact that women from those communities are going to have to work harder to make up the difference.

The Workfare projects provided for in the Family Security Act are in low-wage service jobs traditionally held by women. Forcing women into these projects to work off part of their welfare checks won't lift them out of poverty. To the contrary, it will increase poverty, as one of the other speakers pointed out, by displacing some people who are already in these jobs and undercutting everybody's wages. Moreover, the kinds of jobs which Workfare participants will be forced to take are jobs where women are now trying to do union organizing so it's a union-busting piece of legislation too.

It requires welfare mothers under the age of 18 to live with their parents to whom the welfare check will go directly, forcing more work on women who have already raised one family and may not want the responsibility of raising another. It also deprives the welfare mother of the power to decide how best to provide for her child and increases the state control over the private life of her family. It may force young mothers to stay in family situations where they can be physically or emotionally abused. Further, legislation eliminates for up to six months aid to welfare mothers who refuse jobs because of the nature of the job or because of dissatisfaction of child care for which the bill provides a pitifully small $160 a month at most. This ensures that welfare mothers will be forced to take the worst jobs, the ones nobody else wants, while leaving their kids in inadequate child care programs about which they may have grave doubts. The alternative is to risk having aid cut off which may force women into prostitution and other crimes of poverty or into dependency on men who may be violent or abusive.

From what has been said today, I am reminded of Senator Moynihan's remark that, "We're fast becoming a nation of rich adults and poor children." We're very concerned about that statement because we think it creates a false separation between the parent and child. You can't punish the parent without punishing the child. These sanctions against women who don't cooperate with Workfare programs will punish the child as well as the parent. The truth is that poor women are willing to sacrifice almost anything for their children, not because they love their children more than other women, but because they have to do so often in order to provide for their children's needs.

We oppose the Family Security Act and all other welfare reform proposals that force women into Workfare projects, including mandatory education and training projects. We oppose the mandatory aspect. We want real choices for women. We also want women's unwaged work to be counted in the gross national product so that our contribution to the economy will not remain hidden. We want increases in AFDC in all income-transfer payments. We want an increase in the minimum wage. We want implementation of the Women, Welfare and Poverty Resolution that was part of the plan of action for women passed at the first U.S. National Women's Conference in Houston, Texas, in 1977, which among other things states that homemakers receiving income transfer payments should be afforded the dignity of having that payment called a wage, not welfare. We want military spending cut and the money saved to go immediately into programs that benefit women and children.

CO-CHAIRWOMAN WATSON: We have time for a question or two.

THE AUDIENCE: I don't want to raise a question. I want to say I've tried it all. I've got 16 years of child care experience in South Los Angeles. Right now I'm very frustrated with the pilot GAIN program. I'm trying to encourage people to enroll in the program to learn the skills that are offered to them, but they do not want to pay me the $22 a week for the child care, and the money will be going back to the government for that same reason. I'm very frustrated with this situation, because people have an opportunity now to get into training programs through the schools but the schools need to open their child care programs so that parents have a place to bring their children until they can enroll them in the Head Start program. They bring their toddlers and we get them health screened. They put their children in with our children but it's too early for those four hours a

week, while those parents are learning English. We need a toddler center in our community. We need to open up our schools so the parents have a chance to learn at the same time that the children are learning.

CO-CHAIRWOMAN WATSON: I cannot agree with you more.

THE AUDIENCE: We have a chairperson of our Head Start program and we have done our own census for this year to get refunded. Most of the mothers report that by the time they pay gas and transportation, learn to cope, get a job, and pay child care for that child, they do not come out ahead. So they're stuck on welfare because sometimes they get more that way. Something has to be done.

CO-CHAIRWOMAN WATSON: I agree with you. GAIN is not the way. I want you to know, I, as the Chair of Health and Human Services, and Tom Bates, as the Chair of Human Resources in the Assembly, opposed that concept. When the bill came to my floor, the votes went 32-1. I was the "one" because I understood the detrimental effect it would have on children and their parent or parents. I'm sorry Mr. Shelton is not here but certainly we would like women to have a choice of whether to stay home or go to work. They no longer have that luxury because just to survive, they have to work. If they want to meet the American dream and own a home, it takes two salaries to qualify and we are forcing women away from the nurturing of their children to go to work, often, as the young lady said here, to work at a salary where they will never become economically independent. Los Angeles County is not on-line yet with the GAIN program. There might be anywhere between 70,000 to 90,000 people eligible for that program. The concept that I envision for child care is the same concept as a neighborhood school because a program cannot succeed if poor people have to take their children on our buses, and that's all we have here in Southern California. This is really not true for the people in the Bay Area; I'm talking about right here in L.A. County. We have no Rapid Transit District regardless of the RTD system. Thus parents would have to take their children with them when they go to apply for GAIN and that's some Department of Social Service. Then from there, they're going to be directed to EDD (the Employment Development Department). Then from there, they will be directed to a training site; and then from there, they will be directed to what their other options are. Then if they can't find a job, they'll be directed into Workfare.

Now we do have positions in GAIN that would pay them up front for incidentals but never enough for child care. Although I'll try to be as optimistic about it as I can, I don't have much hope for the program because the funds that were put in there by Senator Roberti for Latchkey have run out. The funds that were in there for child care were way under what was needed. We were told last year in the evaluation that we were between $300-$400 million short in the child care component. Also, we found after their first-year evaluation that over 70 percent of new applicants would need remedial education. So the program is quite wrong. I do believe that we can improve the AFDC program and social services here, but not that way.

The purpose of our task force has been to talk about how we can improve the conditions of the family. If we can improve the conditions of the family, we will certainly be able to improve life for our children. To me it's an abomination to have homeless children. I had a bill that would allow an AFDC recipient to receive a loan against their grant so they could get into replacement housing.

We've never been able to successfully get that bill signed into law. We must make a commitment to our children and to our families. The most conservative among us talk about traditional families' values and at the same time support the GAIN program. You can't have traditional family values with mother and father in the house with a white picket fence and support GAIN. It goes against what you say you want to do. I think mothers ought to be home with their children; and fathers too. If we want to recognize the other parent, then let's identify the other parent and put some incentives there for him to come forward, because the other parent that we're talking about in GAIN is the unwed father who possibly did not know that he had impregnated a young woman because he is very sexually active and has multiple partners. That's the reality of what we're dealing with. The person that receives this grant, for the most part, is the young woman who dropped out of junior high school to have her baby and had no really prior skills. That's who we are dealing with on AFDC. So we have a long way to go.

At the first meeting of our task force we decided not to look at the family as it was traditionally known 50 years ago. That family no longer exists in America today. We're looking at the family in terms of its functions. Whatever the configuration is, let's accept the functions. If the family is a unit of people who provide the nurturing, the nourishing, the resources, the shelter, and the guidance and wisdom to help children grow up to be positive, contributing adults, then who cares about the configuration?

Out of our task force, with our diversity, I think we're going to get something that is positive and I think we will have the guidance and the direction to move into legislation in the very near future. The presenters today, including Congresswoman Schroeder who started off, brought you valuable input based on their own personal experiences, statistics and research, and programmatic involvement. This compilation provides empirical evidence and the substance of public policy. I hope that substance points in a direction of: A, a national policy on the family and children; B, a statewide policy; C, a state department on children and the family. We will work for the best; and I think we'll have the best future that we can ever have.

This meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.

---oOo---